

The  
South Atlantic Quarterly.

Stirring Up the Fires of Race Antipathy

Whatever be his view of the negro problem the average American knows that in the last five years there has been a notable increase in the general opposition to the negro. This development has occurred in both the South and North. In the South it has manifested itself more stenuously than in the North. We see it there in restrictions on the negro vote, in the passage of laws for "Jim Crow" cars, in an increasing resort to lynching, and in a general augmentation of that sensitive disposition on the part of Southerners to take fire at the hint of a "negro outrage." In the North it is seen, but not nearly so plainly as in the South, and it is especially noticeable because in that section it was supposed formerly not to exist at all. It is manifested in occasional acts of violence, as the recent lynching in Delaware, and in a growing opinion which one finds expressed in newspapers and in private conversation with Northern men. This opinion in the North is most strongly held in the large cities and it is noteworthy that in most of the large Northern cities there is a rapid increase of the negro population.

The causes of this development are perhaps numerous. But there are three facts which lie at its bottom and which are worthy of special consideration. These are; inherent race antipathy, the progress of the negro himself, and the fact that the negro problem is, and has been for a long time, a political matter.

Race antipathy is as old as the negro's residence in America. From the earliest days he has been regarded by the whites as an inferior man, and a man with whom unrestricted communication on the part of the whites is degrading. Eleven years after the landing of the first negro in Virginia this idea received a striking illustration in a decision of the highest court in the colony. It was decreed, says the chronicler, "that Hugh Davis be soundly

whipped, before an assembly of negroes and others for abusing himself to the dishonor of God and shame of christians, by defiling his body in lying with a negro; which fault he is to acknowledge next Sabbath day." In 1726 Rev. John Blacknall, of North Carolina, was fined fifty pounds for marrying a white man and a mulatto woman. The commingling which we then set our hearts against in regard to things sexual we have also opposed in regard to most other matters of life. There must be no social equality, no eating together, no joining in amusements, and finally no mingling in religious worship. This feeling has not always appeared on the surface. It has frequently been so well covered over by indifference or opportunism, as to be nearly invisible, but if one will but scratch hard enough he will find it beneath this outer covering.

This antipathy is not mutual. It is not the white man against the negro and the negro against white man. It is not distasteful to the negro to eat his dinner or to go to churches or to theatres, with white men. He is quite willing to have equality. The race feeling is the contempt of the white man for the negro. It is the reaction of the superior against the touch of the inferior; for the white man has no doubt of his own superiority. It is doubtful if the average Southern white farmer would admit that the highest negro in America is superior to the Southern hired man who is white.

The development of the negro since the war has been calculated to intensify this natural race feeling. Singularly enough both his progress and his regression under the regime of freedom have brought down on him the hostility of the whites. His regression might well do this because it has stood for his lapse into a lower state after the removal of the supporting hand of the white man. This lapse has not occurred in all sections of the race—perhaps it has not occurred with a majority of the race—but there can be no denial that some negroes today are more worthless than any negroes in slavery. The master was always a restraining hand on the negro, holding back at both extremes. He kept the slave man from going into the higher fields of intellectual development; he confirmed his lack of high moral purpose and he weighed down his self-respect and his individuality, all of which were checks on the best negroes. On the other hand the master was a

check on the lowest tendencies of the negro. He restrained his dissipations; he sought to save him from disease; he tried to make him honest and peaceable; and he was very careful that he should not be an idler. The removal of the masters's authority has produced a marked change on each of these extremes. The upper class negro has seized with surprising readiness his new opportunity. No sensible man in the North or in the South who is not blinded by passion will deny that the better negroes of the country have made a remarkable record since the days of emancipation. In the same way the lower class have also made a rapid progress. Among them idleness and shiftlessness have increased; petty crimes and quarrels have increased; coarse ideas have found greater sway; and viciousness has augmented. These good and these bad habits are the fruits of his freedom.

Neither of these two classes, the upper and the lower, are all the negroes; and in forgetting this fact some well intentioned people have fallen into serious error. A man whose mind runs away into baseless optimism is apt to point to Booker T. Washington as a product of the negro race. Now Washington is a great and good man, a Christian statesman, and take him all in all the greatest man, save General Lee, born in the South in a hundred years; but he is not a typical negro. He does not even represent the better class of negroes. He is an exceptional man; and, endowed as he is, it is probable that he would have remained uneducated but for the philanthropic intervention of white men. The race, even the best of them, are so far behind him that we cannot in reason look for his reproduction in the present generation. It is, therefore, too much to hope, for a continued appearance of such men in the near future. It is also too much to set his development up as a standard for his race. To expect it is to insure disappointment.

In the same way some people who are pessimistic in regard to the negro base their opinions on their observations of the negro of the lowest class. Said a gentlemen to me recently: "The negro race will die out within a century." His reason was this: a few years ago there were sixteen negroes in the jail of his county, and the county physician had told him that fifteen of them had venereal diseases. From this he argued that the physical constitution of the race was imperiled. Manifestly, it is illogical to

measure either the health, morals, or other quality of the negro by the similar quality of the most depraved. It is true that there is in the race a large lowest class—and a small upper class. And it is true that this lowest class gives the race a certain discouraging tendency. But there is also a strong, and perhaps an increasing, upper class which is ever fighting back its own weakness and shaking off its own shackles.

In this connection I cannot refrain from speaking of a certain false notion in regard to the negro which has caused much error in the opinions of men North and South. I refer to the notion that the ante-bellum negro was a benign old man or a gracious old "mammy," a guardian of the family children, and a dignified expression in ebony of the family honor. The falseness of this notion is due partly to the imaginations of certain novelists and partly to the emotional memories of most Southern women and some Southern men. As to the latter it is pardonable failing. A woman may well remember her old "mammy" and have no recollection of hair-lipped Peter who ran away with a long scar across his forehead, as the advertisements put it. But men who undertake to describe the life of the old South ought to know what it was before they talk about it. Mr. Thomas Nelson Page's castles in Virginia are also castles in the air. The typical ante-bellum negro was the field hand. When we compare the old and the new negro we ought to place the new man by the side of that individual. And if we do not remember what kind of a man the field hand of slavery was—for our novelists have not remembered much about him—we may inform ourselves in the instructive pages of Olmsted, or in Fanny Kemble's interesting "Journal." Nine-tenths of the negroes now in America are descended from this part of the old slave population.

It is important for us to note that the progress of the negro has brought him opposition as well as his regression. Of this the white men who oppose him may not be conscious. They may even fancy that they are the best of friends to the negro. But the advance of the negro in education and in economic conditions brings him ever into new conflicts with the white man. This is true because his advance means a greater degree of comfort—a greater disposition to desire the means of higher life. As long as he was merely a laborer it was not hard to draw the line



which divided him from other people. It was at that time not hard for him to be content with inferior hotels, or with accommodations in the kitchens of better hotels. In these days he is becoming too intelligent and too refined to be content with these things. He demands a better place. Formerly, it did not hurt his pride to ride in a "Jim Crow" car; for he had little or no pride of that kind. Now, he considers this law a badge of inferiority, a mark of intolerance which he will some day seek to wipe out.

With most white Americans there is a very definite notion that the negro has his "place." In their minds this notion is a caste feeling. It is an inherited feeling; and it is not difficult to find facts in the negro's life which seem to give it the support of expediency. To make him know his "place," and to make him keep his "place" sum up the philosophy of many people in reference to this intricate and perplexing problem. But we ought to remember that such an idea is neither scientific nor charitable. The "place" of every man in our American life is such one as his virtues and his capacities may enable him to take. Not even a black skin and a flat nose can justly caste in this country.

The most aggravating cause, however, of the present antipathy between the races is the fact that the negro question is in politics. It has been in politics since the day when the negro became the chief factor in American labor. It was so in Georgia in the days of the benevolent Oglethorpe, when the chief political desire of the people was the admission of negro slaves. It appeared in the great constitutional convention of 1787, when certain Southern States spoke darkly of the future in case they should not be allowed to import slaves. It was a political question in the two angry decades which preceded the Civil War, when abolition fires burned fiercely on the one side and pro-slavery fires on the other. It was still in politics in 1860 and 1861, when eleven States seceded from the union rather than run the risk of having the "black republicans" abolish slavery. It was still a political question in the days of constitutional amendment and in the reactionary days of 1875. It has become a political question in another form within the last ten years. Whatever concerns our secular life we undertake to regulate by political action; and it is not strange that we have so often brought law to bear on this question.

But the negro question has gone into politics recently in a party, rather than in a truly political, sense. It has been seized upon by party leaders as a means of winning votes. This has been particularly true in the South. Always since 1875 the Southern democratic campaigners have used the negro issue with good effect. A certain brilliant party leader, who now hold a large share of public attention, used in the early days of his career, to make his best appeal to the gaping audiences at the country cross roads by asking all the men who wanted to vote the white man's ticket to pass to one side of the road and all who would vote the black man's ticket to stay where they were. When the crowd began to move across the road it was hard for a white man to stand in his tracks. That was the worst manifestation of this form of the issue twenty years ago.

Ten years ago the South was in the embrace of the populist movement, designed by its leaders to organize the mass of farmers into a political association. This movement, if successful, would have broken up the democratic party. It was strong enough to make itself dreaded by the party. To fight it down the leaders of the old party were led to seek a strong issue. The negro issue was selected. It lent itself to the exigency because the populists, wherever they triumphed, had been in alliance with the republicans and had brought a few negroes into office. These negroes were usually quietly disposed, but they were frequently unfit for office; and the very fact that they were negroes made it impossible for them to execute their offices on white men. They were also sometimes unduly elated over their success, being merely ignorant negroes. The result was various conflicts. This gave an opportunity to cry "Negro domination." Raising the cry by the one side produced irritation on the other side, and the very denunciation of negroes for "outrages" produced a continuation of the "outrages." From that time to this the negro issue in the South has taken on a new phase.

In order to ensure its ascendancy the old party passed the suffrage amendments. It promised the people that if they would by this means eliminate the negro vote the old condition of a solid white party would disappear and that we should have no more cheating of negroes out of their votes. The success of these campaigns convinced the leaders that the issue was a popular one.

Having won a complete success they are loath, in spite of their promise, to give up the means by which they succeeded. It is now good party tactics to keep the negro question before the people. Booker T. Washington's dinner at the White House was seized on for this purpose. The watchful party leaders saw in it an opportunito to make capital with the mass of the people. Not long after this there occurred in Washington what has been known since that time as the "bi-racial reception." This, too, at once suggested itself as a popular means of appealing to the people.

So successful were these two attempts that some political editors have learned to look for similar occasions. At present very inconsiderable affairs are made to do service in the same way. An illustration of how this works is seen in the following incident: In the month of August, 1903, Booker T. Washington and a party of prominent negroes, most of them northern men, were going North after the adjournment of a negro business men's conference in Knoxville, Tenn. He telegraphed to the proprietors of a certain dinner-house on the railroad to know if, on the arrival of the train, he and his party could be given breakfast. The reply was favorable. When the train arrived the regular boarders had been served. The party of negroes, which numbered thirty-eight, were given seats in the regular dining-room. The proprietors understood that there were no white people on the train who desired breakfast, but a few presented themselves and tables were improvised for them in other rooms. The negroes, according to the evidence, bore themselves quietly and unobtrusively. There was no attempt to mix the races. It was not alleged that the accommodations of the one were not as good as those of the other. This incident became in the hands of the politicians a flagrant "outrage." A certain emotional and "yellow" newspaper was conspicuous in its lurid descriptions. Black men, it said, were placed before white men. Formerly a white man ate at the first table and sent the negro's dinner out to the kitchen. Now the negro took the principal seat and the whites took what they could get. It gave a long and hysterical description of this very small affair and ended with the observation that the whole thing was due to the fact that President Roosevelt once had Professor Washington to dine with him. Follow-

ing the lead of this prominent newspaper a hundred smaller sheets took up the matter in the same vein; and the dinner-house affair now became very much of a sensation. Day after day for more than a fortnight it continually reappeared in the State press, and the echoes of it are still heard.

The effect of such agitation on the people is decided. It unquestionably tends to make votes. The removal of the negro from the voting population has destroyed the oldest and best political capital of the party; and its place is being supplied by these sensational appeals to the race feeling of the white man. But the affair has a more serious side. This political agitation is awaking a demon in the South. There is today more hatred of whites for blacks and of blacks for whites than ever before. Each race seems to be caught in a torrent of passion, which, I fear, is leading the country to an end which I dare not name.

Up in the North a little Southern gentleman with a glib tongue has been going about recently advocating the formation of a black republic in the Philippines to which all the negroes shall be sent. A man who can solve the negro problem in no better way than to advocate deportation has but little capacity to solve problems. Worthy old Hinton Rowan Helper, who still lives to hear the first threatening notes of a new "Impending Crisis," has a more feasible solution, viz: "to fossilize them beneath the American sod." But neither solution will work. The only solution reserved for us is the adoption of these children of Africa into our American life. In spite of our race feeling, of which the writer has his share, they will win equality at some time. We cannot remove them, we cannot kill them, we cannot prevent them from advancing in civilization. They are now very weak; some day they will be stronger. They are now ignorant and passion-wrought; some day they will be wiser and more self-restrained. I do not know just what form the conflict will take. It may be merely a political conflict: it may be more than that. I am persuaded that it is in many respects the old conflict between Roman plebs and Roman patricians over again. It ought to be shorter than that struggle and the issue ought to be more fortunate than the issue of the Roman conflict; for American life is richer and better than Roman life.

Some day the white man will beat the negro out of his coward-

ice, and then "red shirts" will exist no more. Some day the negro will a great industrial factor in the community; some day he will be united under strong leaders of his own. In that time his struggle will not be so unequal as now. In that time, let us hope, he will have brave and Christian leaders.

The writer has no solution for the negro problem. He does not think that it can be solved by writing magazine articles, or by making speeches. It is the manifestation of a great social force, which will run its course in spite of our laying on of hands. The best we can do is to understand this force as fully as possible, and probably to check in a measure some of its most erratic impulses. We are now just entering the stage of conflict; and this is because the negro is now beginning to be strong enough to make opposition. The conflict will be fiercer in the future than in the present. Lynchings and "outrages" will, perhaps, become more frequent than they now are. As long as one race contends for the absolute inferiority of the other the struggle will go on with increasing intensity. But if some day the spirit of conciliation shall come into the hearts of the superior race the struggle will become less strenuous. The duty of brave and wise men is to seek to infuse the spirit of conciliation into these white leaders of white men. Shall they also be beasts, like the dull-faced black men who stand over against them? Is the white man not superior to the black man—superior in mind, superior in opportunity, superior in obligation to do acts of charity?

## Getting Together on the Negro Question

BY F. C. WOODWARD

The negro problem is a national problem, however Southernly located, to be solved by the white people of the South, the white people of the North, and the negroes, getting together and working together on common ground; for on such agreement and co-work the solution of it depends. The enormousness of the problem begins to appear; it now commands universal attention, while the North and South grapple it with an earnestness never before evinced. To state the mere terms of this problem is to indicate its unexampled difficulties: Here are nine millions of aliens doubling about every forty years, fixed as to habitation, socially ostracised, politically disfranchised, morally undeveloped; in a word, a race a thousand years behind, who must be somehow built into this national fabric, and organically incorporated with this national life and character. Evidently such a consummation shall severely tax the intelligence, patience and forbearance of the whole people for generations to come. The only thing that seems certain about it is that the problem will not be quickly or easily solved.

North and South have only recently begun to unlearn false notions of this question. Just now the South is pleasantly amused over the reversals and summersaults of our Northern fellow-citizens. The South has been keeping a school for Northern immigrants and visitors for forty years past and now has apparently got home to a goodly number of its pupils the difficult lesson, that the North has been all wrong on the negro question! It has even won the North to accept the undoing of most of its labors on that behalf for forty years past. The South may, therefore, be pardoned for its patronizing airs, and its frequent repetitions of "that portentous" and not altogether welcome phrase, "I told you so!"

The North, however, is leading in the important matter of unlearning things. It has confessed its blunder of thinking that freedom and franchise and citizenship could be bestowed by grant and charter, and now realizes that they are lofty privileges to be

won with long waiting and striving. But while the North has thus been correcting its opinions and falling back to a stronger position, the South is hardly yet ready to take its place in this alignment with the sister section. The attitude of the South on the negro question is more confident and assured than the circumstances warrant. It is not an extreme statement that just now the South generally regards the status of the negro as settled, politically by the recent acts of disfranchisement, and socially by providential decree. Neither side seems yet to realize fully that the mighty problem has hardly more than begun its age-long out-working. But it is reassuring to note how both North and South are trying to get together to settle this most far-reaching question that has yet arisen in this land. This is a gratifying contrast to the separatist policy that has led the two sections heretofore to keep each its own uncompromising course, to the hurt of all concerned. This agreement and consequent intelligent entrance upon the business of practical solution cannot, however, help discovering points of difference and misunderstanding among the parties to the solution. And here arises the great need so to bear and forbear with each other that these unavoidable difficulties and misunderstandings shall not alienate good-will, and that discussion of them shall not be ignored or discouraged. At this stage the greatest necessity is that the two sections shall see each other face to face, and say their say heart to heart.

Notwithstanding all recent evidences of harmony and apparent understanding, it seems likely that North and South are not yet at one on the vital questions of suffrage and education for the negro. They are looking at these from different points of view, especially as to their future application. The North accepts the present disfranchisement of the negro as provisional, and his limitation to primary and industrial education as a return to necessary fundamentals, in both cases having in view his preparation to enjoy these in their fulness in due time. It confesses the mistake of his sudden enfranchisement and the infliction upon him of advanced grades of education for which he was unfit; so it wishes to begin afresh to fit the negro for the franchise and the higher education. It seems certain that Southern public opinion does not agree with this view, however the more thoughtful South-

erners may accept it. He who mingles observantly with the rank and file of Southerners, so to speak, will be forced to the conclusion that they regard the disfranchisement of the negro as permanent, and industrial and primary education as sufficient provision for negro education. To the North these steps signify the beginning of opportunity; to the South they signify the limitation of opportunity. This is not the universal Southern sentiment, nor the most enlightened. The thinking men and women of this section are ready to grant to the negro opportunity to win, as he may be able, full citizenship and all it implies educationally and politically. But this opinion is not generally influential as yet, whatever strength it may win in the future.

The North is thus seen to be ahead of the South in unlearning some old lessons and learning some new ones. The South, indeed, is not quick either to learn or to forget in certain directions. With all its recent material progress, its educational development, its political enlargement, and its social readjustments, the South, in matters pertaining to the negro, is naturally reactionary. Southerners know the negro so well, and stand so close to the black peril, that they must be borne with if they move with excessive caution and act with excessive deliberation in dealing with what concerns their mutual relations. Nevertheless they are doubtless too tardy in many things. Let it be borne in mind that experience has refuted but few of their contentions on the subject of the negro, and has confirmed most of them. Evidently, however, the South would do well to both learn some things and unlearn others. It remembers too exclusively the negro's antebellum subserviency, contentment, inefficiency, and incapacity; and it has concluded too quickly that these traits are innate and ineradicable. It fails to learn, but needs to learn, that this backwardness may well have resulted from conditions of slavery that thwarted initiative and crushed aspiration; and that a new order may well arouse new desires and awaken unexpected capabilities in the negro. It is evident, however far behind the white the negro may be, that he has, in the forty years of his pseudo-freedom, shown capabilities that give hope of his final attainment to worthy manhood and useful citizenship. Up to this time, too, his progress has been made against many disadvantages; for what with Northern interference, and what with Southern repression, the negro's environment has not been an encouraging one.



The South, moreover, is slow to grasp the historically proved fact that no large part of a people may be socially, politically, and intellectually repressed; without becoming either a criminal or proletarian class, menacing peace, baulking progress, thwarting prosperity. If selfish aims alone incited the Southerner to seek the settlement of the negro problem, the first lesson they should teach him is that the destinies of white and black are fast interlinked in this section, and, beneficently or maleficently, shall work out together. People are not deported by millions; the man who suggests this solution may be dismissed as a dreamer. He who looks for happy final results from methods of repression may be passed by as impervious to the light of experience, and he who fancies that one-third of the people of a great section can be kept in ignorance, subserviency, and serfdom, while the favored two-thirds enjoy the blessings of a generous civilization stands refuted by history. It has been and still is physically possible to hold an inferior class subservient to their superiors; but if history has proved anything, it is that for both inferior and superior such exploitations result in industrial, political, and moral detriment.

No people can hope to go forward a large portion of whom are doomed by repressive force to social subserviency, political nonentity, and moral irresponsibility, their destiny depending not upon their own wills, but upon the dictum of an ascendant caste. This is the elementary lesson the South sadly needs to learn, and it has not yet turned that page. In truth the South has hardly had time to do more than resist the hurtful innovations of political and philanthropic experimenters with the negro question, and set on foot provisional expedients to meet heroic exigencies, during the past forty years. It has been busy improvising life-rafts when the ship threatened to founder, or rigging jury-masts to put in for repairs. Now, however, the problem has fairly cleared itself of wreckage through the failure of national constitutional provisions and the North's confession of this failure; through the South's constitutional disfranchisement of the negro and the North's acquiescence in that provisional policy; through the new departure of Booker Washington and his co-workers, undertaking from the bottom the negro's educational uplift, and the South's apparent acceptance of this method. These reversals and reforms mark the initial step in this fresh grapple with the

negro problem. It has taken a hundred years to propound the question; and it may take a thousand to work out an answer. The present inquiry should be, What is the part of each section in this out-working? Evidently the North can do little more than assist the South and the negro with money and sympathy, exercising forbearance and patience. The South must bear the brunt and do the work, the whole South, white and black, laboring and suffering and striving together, and likewise bearing and forbearing. For the North, the open hand, the pitying eye, the charity that thinketh no evil, but that hopeth and endureth all things. For the South the hailing steps of hypothesis and experiment, the discouragement of false starts and returns to the post, the bitterness of seeming failure, the heart-sickness of hope deferred; but for South and North white and black alike the final attainment of "the far off divine event," a race uplifted and redeemed, a past atoned, a failure answered.

Let no man fancy that the crimes and blunders which inaugurated and perpetuated human slavery in America are to be righted by resolutions of regret, by acts of legislature, by even the blood sacrifice of war. These are incidents and accompaniments of the disease, symptoms of rally and recovery. The return to normal health can come only through the evolutionary readjustment of social and civil life, with age-long struggle and mighty national travail. It is bootless to seek to fix the fault; time and blood enough have been lost in that futile taste. Indeed, the fault is neither here nor there; is not evidence, but atmospheric. It can be fixed neither on the English legalization of the traffic in human bodies, nor upon the North's side of its unprofitable negroes to the South, nor upon the South's defense of its property right in the slave, not even upon the manstealers who flung him bound on these shores and the man-owners who bound him anew a chattel to the soil. It is the fault of human greed and ignorance harshly visited on innocent whites and blacks alike, blindly diffused through all channels of national life, a subtle blood-poison contracted by one rash act, but lurking for generations in the nation's heart and slowly yielding to the curative treatment of centuries. It illustrates beyond all examples the sardonic maxim of "fathers eating sour grapes, and children's teeth set on edge." May it not be hoped that the final

solution shall demonstrate the moral solidarity of humanity, its innate brotherhood, its divine destiny!

To such outlook the present signs of getting together point with reassurance. The North victorious in arms, but defeated by the logic of events, the South confirmed in its opposition to the futile methods of reconstruction and enfranchisement, have both much yet to learn and to suffer. The North must learn to bear patiently the South's experiments upon the problem, without flying out at mistakes; these will doubtless be many and costly; they will hardly be worse than the Northern like blunders of the past forty or sixty years. The South has set about its solution on the problem's most difficult side; but there is space and time for remedying that misstep. In the situation itself there is the potency of correction and recovery. The acts of disfranchisement still have opportunity for intelligent enfranchisement; the theory of primary and industrial education only for the negro still logically implies all education as he shall be able to achieve it; this meager provision for him of an inferior grade of citizenship, though at present but a devious and rugged trail in the wilderness of bondage, is blazed toward the highway of enlightened citizenship which the negro may reach if he will patiently foot the hard intervening spaces. The civilization of the white man is within the negro's possible achievement; but it can never be his as a gift, or boon, but only as an attainment to be wrought out and lived up to, as the white man himself through some thousand years has shown how. This evolutionary process calls for those abilities, virtues, and conditions which alone have made all evolutions possible; and these are untiring patience, indomitable fortitude, unswerving faith, unstinted time. With these, North and South, white and black, will solve this problem; without these there will be the problem unsolved and after that, —the deluge!

The Southern Education Conference is the present most promising sign of the needful getting together, preliminary for treating the question; but it seems to some to be taking the initial step injudiciously. Those most nearly concerned with it must surely realize its prime cause and purpose. If there were no negro problem, there would be no call for such a conference. But there is need for it, because of the negro problem, and entirely for

that reason. Let all face the situation candidly and fearlessly. The two great sections of our country, long estranged and at cross purposes over the single cause of sectional difference, the negro, now seek to come together for mutual counsel and assistance. God forbid that they should again drag or drift asunder. But they must, unless their rapport is intelligent, tolerant, unselfish and single-minded. North and South have no reason to confer and counsel and campaign together for white education; each can and does care for its own white children. The South seeks from the North no gifts either for white or black, and the North owes the Southern whites nothing "save to love one another." But it owes the black as much as the South owes him, and that is the great debt. The South has done and will continue to do for the negro. It is affording him great opportunities; it welcomes him to all fields of industry, it trains him in the arts of peace, it leads him in the paths of progress, it improves his intelligence and strengthens his morals; every year it expends millions to educate and uplift him; and despite his crimes, his alienation, his ill-advised political hostility, his foolish heed to false councillors, it stands his friend and guardian through the long, trying period of his ethnic nonage. The North owes us much of the same sort, but it is out of the field of active work, and must discharge its share of the debt in other ways. With the ability and humanity that mark the Anglo-Americans as sons of that strain which has set its hand to the work of world-freeing, the North is intent to pay this debt. But let not its generous philanthropists go astray with the idea that the offer of equal help to black and white alike in the South is the way to set about it; for it is not! It is neither the equal need nor the equal right of white and black. Such a view is wrong, and it is utterly impolitic to begin a great movement like this upon such a basis; for every year will show how futile and hurtful it is, and will cry more loudly for reversal. This theory of helping white and black alike confounds justice with generosity, mixes gifts and debts indiscriminately, and finds no justification either in principle or policy. Its continuance will make more and more difficult the acceptance and practical application of the admirable idea propounded by this conference; viz: the dispensing of Northern financial aid to the negro through the agency of the Southern white

men. This is a right movement, and this is its right method. Let the conference maintain this view, but abandon the race-equality heterodoxy in dispensing its bounty.

There are some good reasons why it should do this. This mistake in active policy is proving injurious in several ways. It is arousing, here and there in the South, unreasonable apprehension that this is another scheme to forward negro equality and again get the South by the throat, an apprehension that will be fostered by all the petty politicians great and small whose hold on place and power depends on keeping alive the sentiment of race-hostility. It menaces another and even greater injury by nourishing the hope and desire for northern bounty for Southern educational institutions. There is no objection to men's giving their money to such objects. But there should be serious objection to the encouragement of persistent solicitations that soon degenerate into mercenary scrambling and pauperizing dependence. One of the most insidious forms of institutional pauperism is that which excuses its offences against taste and manners and morals by pleading the needs and worthiness of the cause it represents. This growing plague is eating into some men and institutions and poisoning public opinion all over the land. It is only necessary for it to be bruited abroad that this or that man or corporation has something to bestow, to set at his heels a pack of hungry petitioners. Doubtless the officers of the Southern Education Conference and General Education Board might give examples of this mania. Southerners used to be too proud to ask or take gifts, or even to invite benefits. It will be a sad day when this pride yields place to a poverty of spirit that teaches "to crook the pregnant hinges of the knee where thrift may follow fawning." It is good that the "Old South" still keep the "old" sturdy independence that knew how to be poor and contented, simple and high-minded. Helping people whose best education is self-help and who have the means of self-help within reach degrades both giver and receiver. It is to be hoped that the North, in its South-helping movements for negro education, will correct this initial mistake, this confusion of duty and charity, this mingling of debt and alms, and fix organization on the safe basis of Northern obligation to the education and civilization of the negro.

## North Carolina's Part in the Revolution

BY SALLIE JOYNER DAVIS,

Professor of History and English, Greensboro Female College

To secure their rights as British subjects under the British constitution was the animating thought that first organized resistance to every measure of the king or parliament aiming at the infringement of colonial privileges. This idea, which made the Americans one in thought and sentiment, was gradually displaced by the idea of independence, which never laid hold on the minds and hearts of the entire people, but rather became a principle of action for a patriotic few scattered throughout the colonies. What was true of one colony was true of all, and that North Carolina was not dominated by the idea of independence is a fact established beyond all dispute.

It was the scattered patriotic few whom William Hooper had in mind when he wrote to James Iredell, April 26, 1774: "With you I anticipate the important share which the colonies must soon have in regulating the political balance. They are fast striding to independence and will ere long build an empire on the ruins of Britian, will adopt its constitution purged of its impurities, and from an experience of its defects will guard those evils which have wasted its vigor and brought it to an untimely end."

The General Assembly of North Carolina had recently been dissolved by the order of Governor Martin, the courts were already closed, the people were dazed and seemed waiting for a leader. This they found in Col. John Harvey, of Perquimons, the Speaker of the assembly. When he learned of the dissolution of the assembly he openly, defiantly declared that the people would convene one for themselves. Accordingly he sought the advice of Willie Jones, of Halifax. A day later, April 4th, he met Samuel Johnston, of Chowan, and Col. Edward Buncombe at the home of the latter in Tyrrel and urged their co-operation. "He was in a violent mood," wrote Johnston, "and declared he would lead the way and issue hand bills in his own name for a convention independent of the government."\*

---

\*The statements in this paper are collected without exception from the North Carolina Colonial and State Records, Vol. IX to XVII.

After a change of both time and place, a convention was agreed upon to meet at New Bern, August 25, 1774. "This was the first representative Assembly that ever met in North Carolina or in America save by royal authority. Instead of having royal authority, it had popular authority and met in open, flagrant defiance of the Crown, its Governor and his proclamations." It consisted of seventy members, twenty-nine of the thirty-five counties being represented on the first day of its session. The choice of Colonel Harvey as Moderator was happily made because from him first came the suggestion for the creation of such a body. On the third day the convention through a set of resolves took its stand in regard to the British king, the British constitution, and the acts of the British parliament. It approved of the general convention to be held in the city of Philadelphia on the 20th of September next; elected William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, and Richard Caswell to the said convention, investing them with such powers as may make "any act done by them or consent given in behalf of this province, obligatory in honor upon every inhabitant thereof who is not an alien to his country's good;" levied the sum of twenty pounds proclamation money upon each county to defray the expenses of the said delegates; provided for a committee of five persons to be chosen in each county to see that the resolves of the convention be properly carried out.

In pursuance of the recommendation contained in the last clause, county committees, or as they were familiarly known Committees of Safety, were organized throughout the province. In some counties as many as twenty persons were appointed. In Bute county Benjamin Ward suggested that one person from "every kin" be selected. These committees rapidly became the keystone of a new popular government that was destined to usurp new powers and blot out every vestige of the royal government.

Another convention met in New Bern on April 3d, 1775. The proceedings were doubly interesting because the function of its delegates were two fold, first as members of the convention and second as members of the assembly. Circumstances had forced Governor Martin to issue writs for a legislature to assemble at New Bern. A little later, February 11th, 1775, Colonel Harvey

requested the respective counties and towns to elect delegates to a convention to meet also at New Bern, April 3rd—the same time and place for the meeting of the legislature. Accordingly both met in the same room, the convention on the 3d, and the assembly on the 4th. Of the one, there were sixty-seven members, of the other, fifty-five, every member of the assembly being a member of the convention. In each Colonel Harvey was the presiding officer. When the governor dissolved the assembly on the morning of the 8th, the members continued to exercise their function as members of the Provincial Congress.

The time that intervened between the adjournment of the congress in April and the meeting of another in August was rich with events. The Mecklenburg Declaration, the action of the New Bern Committee of Safety, the Resolves of the Mecklenburg Committee, the call for a new convention, the flight of Governor Martin, and the destruction of Fort Johnston followed in rapid succession. Active preparations were made for the defence of the province. The Committee of Safety of Wilmington ordered a list of all white male inhabitants of the town from sixteen to sixty years of age, also a list of all free mulattoes and negroes. It addressed a letter to Samuel Johnston urging a call for a convention as the situation was becoming alarming. It pointed out the necessity for keeping in pay a number of men for the defence of the province, that such could only be done by a convention, which alone could fall upon a proper method of paying them. It declared that Governor Martin was collecting men and arms, encouraging an insurrection of the negroes and strengthening Fort Johnston with new works. "We have a number of enterprising young men that would attempt to take the Fort but are much afraid of having their conduct disavowed by the Convention."

It is remembered that before adjourning, the last convention at New Bern provided that in case of Colonel Harvey's death Samuel Johnston should issue a call for a convention whenever it seemed necessary for the good of the province. Colonel Harvey died in June, and on the 13th day of July, Johnston requested the counties and towns to elect delegates to a convention to be held at Hillsboro, August 21st, 1775. As affairs of the greatest importance were to be submitted to their deliberation he recom-



mended that the number of delegates should not be less than five. Two hundred and fourteen delegates were elected in all, but only one hundred and eighty-four assembled at the appointed time, though every county and town in the province was represented.

On the first day a committee was appointed to confer with those inhabitants of the province who entertained any religious or political scruples with respect to associating in the common cause, to remove all ill impressions that had been made upon them by the agents of Governor Martin, that unless they stood by the king they would become liable for their conduct of 1771, and to induce them by argument and persuasion to unite for the protection of the constitutional rights and privileges thereof.

On the 23d, a test which had been prepared by a committee appointed the first day, was signed by every member of the convention.

The greater part of the twenty days during which the congress sat was devoted to matters the significance of which has not been fully appreciated after a lapse of more than a century and a quarter, the rejection of the Articles of Confederation, the formation of a temporary government and the military organization of the province.

On the 24th a draft of the articles sent in by the former delegates to the Continental Congress, was presented for consideration, with the request that the plans might be considered as not having had the sanction of the Continental Congress or recommended by the delegates, but with the wish that it might be "dispassionately debated and approved or condemned on its own intrinsic merits."

On the fourth of September the committee reported that after having taken into consideration the plan, they were of the opinion that the "same was not as yet eligible." They also recommended that the delegates of the province ought to be instructed not to consent to any plan of confederation which might be offered in an ensuing congress until the same had been approved by the Provincial Congress. Just why the plan was rejected is now an open question, but probably it was caused by the conservative element of the congress led by its presiding officer and the fact that in the seventh article of the proposed plan, the number of delegates to a general congress must be regulated by the number of polls, one to every five thousand.

On the same day the plan for a permanent federal union was introduced, a committee was appointed to prepare a plan for the regulation of the internal peace and safety, to make such an arrangement in the civil police of the province as might tend to supply in some measure the defect of the executive powers, arising from the absence of His Excellency, Governor Martin, to take into consideration the propriety of appointing a Committee of Safety, the mode to be observed in calling provincial conventions, the time of election, the number which every town and county was to send as delegates to represent them in such conventions, and the powers these conventions were to exercise. In due time the committee reported, September 4th, and on its report the congress proceeded to create a temporary government. A Provincial Council of thirteen members was established, in which all civil powers of the province were vested. These powers were small, however, in comparison with the large military powers conferred upon it. Next in power and under its immediate control were the District Committees of Safety, six in number, consisting of thirteen members each. The duty of these committees was to control the militia and all other forces within their respective jurisdictions and to supervise the town and county committees. As the county committees had been in existence for more than a year and had grown too powerful to be abrogated, the congress attempted only to regulate their numbers and powers; and to establish the two higher authorities to which the decisions of the county committees were to be submitted. Thirty-six in number, these consisted of twenty-one members each. New Bern, Edenton, and Wilmington were each allowed a committee of fifteen members, and in every other town having the right of representation, there was a committee of seven. With the establishment of the Provincial Council and the committees, the organization of North Carolina as a self-governing commonwealth was practically complete.

By no means the least efficient work was the military organization of the Province. On the 24th of August it was unanimously resolved that the inhabitants pay their full proportion of the expenses incurred by raising an army for the preservation of American liberty. Upon the strength of this resolve, the congress considered the condition of the province and the expediency

of employing a military force for its defence against foreign and domestic invasion. On the first of September it was ordered that a thousand regulars be raised for the continental line, to be divided into two regiments of five hundred each under the command of Colonels James Moore and Robert Howe. These regulars were enlisted for the war and their expenses were to be defrayed out of the funds provided for that purpose by the Continental Congress. They were to be kept in three months' pay unless the Provincial Council should judge it necessary to keep them longer. The council was empowered to disband them at any time before or after their term of three months expired. The recruiting officers of the army were ordered to advance to each non-commissioned officer and private who enlisted forty shillings in part payment of his first month's pay. Ten shillings were allowed to each officer for every man who enlisted as a full compensation for his expenses in recruiting his men.

To provide for the defense of a province, it was divided into the six districts following the old Superior Court districts of Edenton, Halifax, New Bern, Wilmington, Hillsboro, and Salisbury, and in each of these the congress ordered that a battalion of minute men be raised consisting of ten companies of fifty each. These were nothing more nor less than volunteer militia with the privilege of electing their commissioned officers, and were held for such service as the committee thought necessary. In enlisting preference was given to those who had guns of their own. To supply the deficiency the committees were authorized to borrow such guns as were fit for service, ten shillings per annum being allowed for a musket and twenty for a rifle. The minute men were drilled fourteen days in the beginning of the service and after that once a fortnight. A bounty of twenty-five shillings was allowed each non-commissioned officer and private to purchase a uniform, consisting of a hunting shirt, leggings or splatter-dashes and black garters.

The organization of the militia had been well looked after and consequently few changes were made in its laws. One, however, was that drafts of three months' enlistment should be made whenever the service of the militia was required at a distance. Militia companies were actively organized against the tyranny of England as early as 1774. On the 22nd of September of that

year, each company of Rowan militia was authorized to raise the sum of twenty pounds proclamation money to be disposed of by the Rowan Committee of Safety. In a letter to Samuel Johnston dated January 8th, 1775, Richard Caswell stated that the militia was forming into companies and choosing their officers in every part of the county. In fact, so prevalent had the movement become, that Governor Martin on the 16th of June issued a proclamation forbidding the people to array themselves in companies.

October 19, a little more than a month after the end of the congress, the Provincial Council held its first session at Johnston Court House. To this body belongs the credit for the ease and despatch which the orders of the late congress were put into execution. How well the military forces were organized will appear from the fact that before the close of the year, Colonel Howe with a part of the regulars was sent to aid Virginia against the British at Norfolk, a body of seven hundred militia under Colonels Polk and Rutherford and two hundred and twenty regulars under Colonel Martin were ordered to South Carolina to suppress a tory rising.

By the beginning of the year 1776, the plans for a vigorous campaign against the province were well nigh completed by the British government. Sir Henry Clinton, of New York was put in command of the expedition. Seven battalions were sent over from England. The British troops from Virginia and South Carolina were ordered to join Clinton in the vicinity of Wilmington. With the co-operation of the Scotch in the Cape Fear district and other disaffected ones, Clinton hoped to gain a foot hold in the province that would ultimately lead to its subjection. Accordingly, Governor Martin and General McDonald on the 10th of January, issued commissions to twenty-six men of Cumberland, Anson, Chatham, Guilford, Orange, Rowan, and Bute counties to raise an army of His Majesty's most faithful subjects against a horrid and most unnatural rebellion, to march to Brunswick reaching there about the 15th of February, where they were to await the British forces under Clinton.

During all this time the whigs were not idle. The New Bern Committee of Safety ordered Colonel Caswell with his company of minute men and the militia of Dobbs, Johnston, Pitt and Orange to join other forces collected from the different parts of

the province. These met Colonel James Moore with a part of the continentals at Cross Creek where they were reinforced later by the militia of Wilmington, Onslow, Duplin, Guilford and other points further west and southwest. The plan was to prevent a junction between the Scotch and tories and the British at Wilmington. The campaign lasted little more than three weeks when it ended in the battle of Moore's Creek, February 27th, 1776. The remarkable fact about the campaign is the promptness and enthusiasm with which it was conducted and its effectiveness in crushing out for a time all tory spirit.

The fourth Provincial Congress met at Halifax during the months of April and May of that year. The work of this convention alone might fill a volume, but the purpose of this paper is to present as far as possible the military organization and the support of North Carolina to the Revolution. Four new continental regiments were created by the congress. These with the two voted by the last congress were divided into six battalions, each of which, consisting of eight companies, was commanded by a colonel, a lieutenant-colonel, and a major. Each company consisted of fifteen officers and seventy-six rank and file. The Continental Congress having appointed Colonel James Moore, of the First Regiment, and Colonel Robt. Howe, of the Second to the command of Brigadier-Generals, the Provincial Congress appointed in their steads Francis Nash and Alexander Martin who had been the lieutenant-colonels of those regiments. Jethro Sumner, Thomas Polk, Edward Buncombe, and Alexander Lillington were to command the four new regiments. The other officers were nominated by the several districts and later appointed and assigned to their respective companies by the congress. Careful instructions were given to the recruiting officers. They were to enlist only able-bodied men over five feet four inches high, not deaf, or subject to fits, or ulcers on their legs, or ruptures. A bounty of forty shillings, an advance of three pounds and a sum of one shilling a day until he joined his regiment was allowed each recruit who enlisted for two years and six months. The pay of the recruiting officers was the same allowed by the preceding congress, ten shillings for every man enlisted. Realizing that the only hope of effectually defending the province against any invasion or uprising lay in the militia, more effective laws for

the same were made. It was brigaded according to the six districts and John Ashe, Edward Vail, Allen Jones, Griffith Rutherford, Thomas Person, and William Bryan were appointed brigadiers. All effective men from sixteen to sixty years of age were ordered to join the militia, those of one county forming a regiment which was divided into ten companies of not less than fifty rank and file. For the more effective service, the companies were divided into five parts, one part containing the older men and the other four parts the more active and younger men.

No brigade, regiment, company, or division of militia was to be commanded by any but militia officers except when such militia was ordered by the civil power to join the continental troops. In that case the continental officer of equal, and the militia officer of superior, denomination should command. No change was made in the pay of the militia officers beneath the rank of brigadier-general, but each private was allowed two shillings and six pence a day while in active service. All persons were liable to be drafted except such as had borne appointments or commissions under the authority of the general and Provincial Congresses, justices of peace; ministers of some church regularly called, overseers of slaves exceeding five taxables in number, schoolmasters, millers and ferry-keepers. Those so drafted were obliged to serve, or find able-bodied men in their places under the penalty of ten pounds.

Ten light horsemen were attached to every regiment and were arrayed in one or more companies when they joined the brigade, at the discretion of the brigadier-general. The congress provided for three companies of independent light horse on the condition that the same be placed on the continental establishment by the Continental Congress.

An artillery company consisting of fifty men commanded by Capt. John Vance was ordered to join General Moore, and for the immediate defense of the extreme eastern coast five independent companies were raised to be placed along the coast from Currituck to Deep Inlet. These companies were under the control only of the Provincial Congress or any executive power acting in the recess of the same.

The work of executing the orders of the congress was difficult. It is frequently stated that the province was ablaze with enthusiasm throughout the years of seventy-four, seventy-five, and

seventy-six, and that the ardor of the people began to cool in the latter part of seventy-seven. The foregoing paragraphs of this paper seem to justify the first part of this statement, but after all, was it the enthusiasm of the people or of a few patriotic leaders who had set up a new government and had managed to get into the field less than 10,000 volunteers? The truth of the matter is, that there should have been at this time twenty-five thousand volunteers and that the cooling process did not begin in the fall of seventy-seven, but in the summer of seventy-six.

In May, 1776, the Continental Congress ordered that a part of the militia from four of the districts should be sent to the defence of Wilmington. Colonel William Bryan, of Johnston, experienced so much difficulty in drafting the number required of that county that the Council of Safety ordered the task to be placed in the hands of Needham Bryan, late sheriff of the county.

The recruiting officers of the continental ranks no sooner took the field than their troubles began. Their letters of complaint to the Council of Safety became painfully numerous. As one of the chief complaints was the desertion of the new recruits, the council on the memorable Fourth of July directed the captains of the continental troops to pay a sum of money for the apprehension and deliverance of any deserting soldier belonging to their companies, the said sum to be deducted from the pay of the deserter. This proved a lucrative business for one Thomas Amis, of Bladen, who was allowed one hundred and twenty pounds for the apprehension of nineteen deserters. William Hooper no doubt felt justified in declaring that the patriotism of the common soldier was a mere bubble and "that pay well and hang well were the grand secrets of making an army." Joseph Hewes was somewhat of the same opinion when he wrote to a friend as early as May 17th, "It is a melancholy fact that near half of our men is to be found nowhere but on paper." But he shows himself the patriot leader in the next sentence, "If our situation were ten times worse, I could not agree to give up the cause."

In spite of these difficulties, soldiers for the new battalions were enlisted and placed at the disposal of the Continental Congress.\*

---

\*The light horse raised by the Provincial Congress were refused by the Continental Congress on the grounds that they were expensive troops and of little service in the contest. They must have been accepted later as the records show that they rendered valuable service later on, especially during the years of '80 and '81.

In May the entire force of the continental troops were ordered to Wilmington together with the Edenton, New Bern, Halifax and Wilmington brigades of militia, 1,500, under General Ashe to keep in check the British on the Cape Fear river. As the Hillsboro and Salisbury districts were chiefly inhabited by wheat farmers who could not well leave their crops at that time, no drafts upon these districts were made. It is probable, too, that congress had in mind rumors of the temper of the disaffected in those districts, particularly around Hillsboro. Two months later, in reply to General Rutherford's appeal for aid against the Cherokees, the Council of Safety wrote, "We cannot think of ordering any troops out of the Hillsboro Brigade, as you well know how many disaffected persons reside in that district and neighborhood."

When the British left Wilmington and went to Charleston four battalions and part of the militia followed, leaving the fifth and sixth battalions in camp at Wilmington. The troops played a glorious part in the defeat of Clinton, June 28th, General Lincoln who was commander-in-chief of the southern forces said of them, "I know not which corps I have greatest reason to be pleased with, Muhlenburg's Virginians or the North Carolinians, they are equally alert, zealous and brave."

When Washington's position in the North became critical after the Battle of Long Island, the Continental Congress in September directed General Moore with the first and second battalions to proceed to New York with all possible speed. A few days later September 16th, the order was modified and left to the discretion of the Council of Safety to execute or suspend it. The indication of another invasion, of a very severe winter, and the knowledge of the poor equipment of the army induced the council to order the troops to encamp about Wilmington and New Bern where they would be in a position to protect their own province and to render any assistance to South Carolina and Georgia. A general return of the brigade dated October 20th, 1776, shows a total strength of 2,035.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]



## Another View of Our Educational Progress

BY WILLIAM E. DODD, PH. D.,

Professor of History in Randolph-Macon College

There is no question which approaches in importance that of the proper training of young people; and in our country where individualism holds such undisputed sway and where neither the state nor the church assumes exclusive control of education, it can hardly be out of place for individuals to point out the faults as well as to dwell upon the merits of our system or systems of public instruction. It is the purpose of this short paper to call attention to what seem to be some of the dangerous tendencies in the policy of our schools, both low and high—tendencies which will be noted by almost any one who will take the trouble to observe what goes on around him every day. This paper is furthermore based on observations of the writer within a comparatively narrow range of experiences, i. e., observations which relate particularly to the Southern conditions. Whether they do not also apply in other sections of the country the reader may determine for himself.

The object of education is to develop in the growing child, or in older persons, a sane knowledge of self, of external conditions and of the best method of adjusting one's self to these external conditions. If this is the aim of those who teach, whether they do it in the home or in the school, it seems that every possible effort should be made to prepare young minds by degrees for the difficulties, the duties, and the responsibilities of a normal human life. There should be no learning of things which must be unlearned, and therefore no revolutions in the lives of men and women as they grow to maturity, but a steady development, a continuous widening of the intellectual and moral horizons in the same way that one's physical powers continue to grow and expand.

Instead of this, however, the child is surrendered at a very early age to servants whose actions suggest no normal purpose, no real character. These guardians of the young are not only not moral, they are in many instances actually immoral, meas-

ured by the standards which will afterwards be applied to the grown-up child; they have almost no education, their language is a perfect jargon. At the same time the young mind is watching every movement, listening to every sound, in order to imitate them as soon as possible. For five or six years the child is compelled to spend nearly all its time with such companions, the parents meanwhile giving only occasional attention to this development, important as this early period is in the life of every rational being. Whenever the child sees anything of father or mother it is only to be petted and fondled; whenever its will runs contrary to the wish of the nurse, the child is given its way, and in most instances, even the parents surrender to its every whim. So that in both mental and moral things the chances are very much against the child. Its language is not even expected to be intelligible; it must learn to talk twice before this advanced stage is approached.

When the school age approaches another change takes place—a very important one for all concerned in the future of the child. It would be expected that great care would be exercised at this stage and some trouble is taken; but it is only short-lived. The teacher to whom the boy is sent is a cheaper man usually than he who “clerks” in the father’s store, or, who looks after the farm; if not a cheap man she is in many instances a young woman hardly out of her teens and waiting for a proposal of marriage, accumulating, meanwhile, a scanty outfit for the prospective home! This is the state of affairs in Virginia and North Carolina at any rate.

But what makes it worse is the attitude the father and mother assume towards the boy or girl at this time of life. The child is, to be sure, the most important person in any household, and this is the greater reason that he should be disciplined gently but firmly and unceasingly. Quiet purposeful guidance should be given to every child at this stage. As a matter of fact, however, the boy just entering school is absolute master of the house; his opinions are consulted, his vanity flattered, his comfort, to the discomfort of every one else often times, is most assiduously looked after. In his relations to other boys he is taught to seek his own good; he is applauded by the father if he gets the better of his playmate in a bargain or in a personal encounter. Every

one seems to fail to recognize that childhood is the only period of life when the grosser selfish tendencies can be effectually curbed. Under these conditions is it not miraculous that our boys and girls are not worse than they are when they come regularly into contact with the outside world?

In the schools there are still other evils which must be combatted or else the young character will be injured. 1. Those who consider themselves as belonging to a sort of high nobility in our American democracy send their children to private schools or seek for them special tutors. The teachers of these schools, or family tutors, are absolutely dependent on the good will of their patrons. Real training, consisting in restraining the appetite, governing the will, and learning new and difficult facts, is the last thing to be thought of. Every thing must be perfectly agreeable to the little monarchs of our land, any discomfort whatever is sufficient cause for giving up any task, however necessary.

Lessons must not only be explained step by step, they must be made easy; the child is not supposed to exert himself in order to accomplish the will of his teacher. The teacher is expected to do this and not only this but to make the way to knowledge so smooth that the child follows it as along the line of least resistance. 2. The other class of people, those who think they ought to be nobles but who have not as yet obtained the means necessary to that estate, send their children to the public schools. Here again the teacher is the slave of the community and the child is the master. Wholesome moral training is next to impossible because the teacher is first an underpaid officer. As has been suggested, he seldom receives as much for attempting to train the young minds of the community as the shoemaker for repairing old shoes. Again the tenure of office with the teacher depends on the good will of a few individuals who, if they imagine their children have been wronged ever so slightly, decline to patronize the school and the trustees must discharge the teacher. The child is thus given control of the school and of the community in so far as education goes. As a result the public school teacher is as helpless as the private tutor; he must make all his ideas of discipline both mental and moral accord with those of a half dozen of his patrons, which patrons have done little but spoil their children in the home and who in this second stage of their

educational influence set deliberately to work to spoil their neighbors' children if there should remain any who are not already beyond hope. It was only a week ago that the writer saw a helpless public school teacher struggling against all these adverse circumstances. Poor fellow, in his desperation, he had set aside ten dollars of his own slender five hundred a year to be spent for a gold medal to be awarded to the pupil who had done the best all-round work. But instead of gratifying any one he offended five different families because their children did not get the medal and pleased only one, perhaps, spoiling the recipient besides by ministering to his vanity. At the closing exercises of the school twenty-five medals were awarded, some for attendance which is but the duty of every one, others for not making mischief, which is also supposed to be incumbent on every child in school. These twenty-five medals or prizes were distributed among the children of a school whose attendance was about one hundred, i. e. every fourth child received a reward for something! At the end there was universal complaint among the patrons, one good woman going so far as to scold the teacher because her little girl had not received a prize when she had been expecting it and had come dressed for the occasion at considerable expense! This we call the training of children for lives of usefulness. It is little more than training of vain cox-combs who, unless a merciful providence intervenes, will continue to be burdens on their families or on society.

But suppose the boy passes through this stage of so-called training with personality and ambition enough left for him to desire to go to college. He begins to inquire where he shall go. No sooner than his important wish is known he receives personal letters from a half dozen college presidents who treat him as though he were master of the situation, and the father not only encourages him in thinking thus but allows him to exercise his own will in deciding the important matter. This is well understood by the heads of all our great (?) institutions; they pay the sixteen year old boy a visit and give him glowing pictures of their respective colleges! The boy at last makes up his mind and when the day arrives he appears on the campus of his chosen school ready to criticise and condemn every thing that does not measure up to the promises of the president, which is impossible

in most cases, to pass judgment upon the fitness of his teachers and to write home complaining of the "abominable fare at his boarding place." Officers and teacher soon learn of his complaints and again the college president seeks to please his injured majesty and to persuade him to remain, as though the very existence of the institution depended on his good will and personal favor.

In a short while the boy decides to remain, he becomes identified with some secret fraternity composed of similar spirits and makes up for all his imaginary ills by getting together with his fellows and abusing all that does not please him. Idleness, drinking, even worse habits, are apt to fix themselves upon him and he returns home at the end of the session an accomplished do-nothing. The next year on his return to college his arrival is announced in the daily papers; he is elected to some office in his club, he becomes a member of the football team and forthwith his photograph goes into the papers and a sketch of his worthless life is given to the public. From that time on he is hopelessly ruined but never imagines himself to be of less importance than the president of his school who, by the way, has had a great share in his unmaking.

In the class-room such a fellow is worse than useless; he is never prepared, indeed he deems himself above the drudgery of hard work. And if he makes even a half success in athletics his teacher takes note of the fact and grades him up accordingly, knowing full well that student opinion rules the faculty and that the executive authority of the institution is against any teacher who does not let such men pass. In some schools of supposed high standing certain teachers, men of real standing, too, in their chosen fields, are openly accused in student publications of counting "athletic standing" in making up their grades for the year.

In this period of four years another side of his character is touched. Having been brought up in a Christian home, though this is not a very common thing with us to-day, he goes to a college where the form of Christianity prevails, where ministers of the Gospel apologize for their calling and where student life is almost anti-Christian; he soon accepts the faith of the place—self-love—and gives up whatever of real faith he may have had. He sees Christianity patronized but not believed in, taught by

his professors, perhaps, but not practised, and it only confirms him in his worship of self. The real foundation of a successful life, an abiding faith in something, is left out of his training; in the place of it nothing but an egotistical infidelity is left.

Still there is the "code honorable" which prevails at college, we are reminded. Let us see what vitality there is even in this. A young man applies for a catalogue of a first rate school. He receives it and is informed that the expenses are, say, \$300 a year. Though the father has an income of \$2000 to \$3000 annually, the president of the school informs him that he may receive his tuition free (if some other institution is suspected of having some influence with the family) under certain conditions. The father perjures himself by signing a solemn statement that he is unable to pay his son's tuition and the boy goes to college spurning the so-called "poor students," spends \$600 to \$1000 a year, at the same time accepting from the state or the corporation, as the case may be, free tuition, while the men who teach him, so far as he can be taught, are poorly paid because that same state or corporation is *unable to pay*. And to complete the young man's undoing he is encouraged systematically to despise his fellow-citizens of the college community. Families of higher standing than his own are snubbed by him because he is in college and they in the college town. He goes out at night to tear up bridges and to carry off gates or otherwise injure property. The college authorities to whom he is unfortunately alone amenable wink at his lawlessness, encourage him in thinking himself above the law and exempt from its penalties.

Finally he concludes his four years of romping idleness; he has heard the names of the subjects he has pretended to study; he knows a few of the terms in which those subjects are expressed, but little more. Still he has passed most of his examinations; he will pass the finals by sheer "cramming" and by the help of "ponies." The few he has actually failed on will be made in "specials" at five dollars each and he will on commencement day don a ridiculous gown suited to mediaeval monks and appear before a vast concourse of people and be pronounced a "bachelor of arts" and sent out into the world a helpless and almost ruined man.

While this is not the course which every boy pursues at school

and college it is so nearly that of a large number of them, that, in view of the many thoughtful men, some remedy ought to be attempted. It will be said in the first place that well-to-do parents will not personally devote themselves to the training of their children, and in the second that our schools do turn out good men and women after all. If the so-called better classes will not assume the responsibility of training their children, then they must at least pay the necessary price for good teachers to undo the evil work of incapable nurses and pay enough that the poorer children of the community who have not, in the main, been subjected to the ills of the nursery, may get good training free. And if the college turns out *some* good and capable graduates it is the more pertinent to ask, why not have all thus well equipped?

As to the restraining of the egotistic disposition of all children, it need only be said that there ought to be a time in the life of every one when he is not free but subject, properly speaking, to the will of another. Prizes, rewards and honors for trivial efforts or no efforts at all are so many dead-weights cast into the scales against education. The impoliteness of the American boy is proverbial; in no other land is a boy allowed to disport himself wherever and whenever he chooses to the discomfort of his seniors. The recently adopted custom of schools and colleges, running a useless course of competition, sending their presidents out into the "highways and hedges" to compel students into their halls is nothing short of degrading. It puts education in the position of a business enterprise and makes of a man who ought to be our highest authority in matters of culture a mere drummer of students. The greatest universities in the world and the most successful, judged from the finished product, never pay a cent for advertisement, never think of publishing catalogues, to say nothing of personally persuading men to attend them. Their policy has been for hundreds of years to secure the ablest and most renowned teachers, cost what they may, and then leave the prospective student to decide at his peril where he will go to college.

In the South he have of recent years modified all this with the effects described. We *must* have the students in order to impose upon the legislature or upon some money-giving body. And

when more money is obtained it is expended not in getting abler teachers and better equipments but in getting *more students* by fair means, or foul. Under this regime standards of entrance go to the winds and the institutions having all grades of men in the same classes must find some method of "getting the 'average' man through." Is this education? Is this honest public service?

There ought not to be such a wide chasm between the college graduate and the successful teacher, lawyer or business man. If the college and university do what they profess to do, and ought by law to be compelled to do, there will not be this difference. Yet every one knows what bitter experiences await the average "A. B." as he leaves his college halls to take up his lifework. He knows his diploma will not be accepted anywhere except as a starting point for further study. The state does not even accept the law diplomas of its own schools and allow their holders to begin to practice their professions! It likewise refuses to accept diplomas from its greatest medical schools as indicating that those who hold them are equipped for their calling. In each case new examinations must be passed. A period of disheartening probation and trial must be passed through by every one; a period when no one exactly trusts the young man just beginning life, a period when not even the *alma mater* has confidence in him and when one is oft times forced to the wall in the very beginning of life. This comes of false standards of work and worth in the period of training. No man should be permitted to enter college who does not give reasonable promise of being able to complete a course of study sufficiently thorough and broad to enable him to become a successful man and citizen in his chosen calling. Still less should any one be allowed to secure a degree from any school when he is not equal to all the degree promises. College policy, no matter what its needs, legislative and otherwise, should never stoop to "student getting" and the making of "large graduating classes."

The difficulty is deep-rooted, and especially in our Southern schools, where such a strange policy seems to have gained such complete sway. It runs all the way through our system of training. It must be remedied in the home, in the common and high schools, and above all in the college. And while we are moving heaven and earth to get more money for our schools of all grades,



to get more boys and girls into these schools, may we not do well to look to this other side of our educational reform? It is not in equipment, in free scholarships, in varied courses, though all of these may be advantageous, that the real work of education goes forward, but in the making of morally responsible and rational men and women who can themselves add to the sum of our civilization.

## The Function of Criticism in the South

By EDWIN MIMS,

Professor of English Literature, Trinity College

Matthew Arnold's essay on the Function of Criticism at the Present Time, though written primarily for the English people and in view of English conditions, is applicable to any people at any time. It is a concise and strong statement of an idea that runs through all his works—a presentation of his method of dealing with literature, society, government, and religion. In the minds of many the word criticism has an altogether unfavorable meaning; the critic is considered destructive. In Arnold's mind criticism is not destructive, but constructive; the critic is not a satirist, though he may use satire to give point to his words; he is not a pessimist, though he may at times draw dark pictures of actual conditions. Though not so great as the creative writer, he yet helps to prepare the way for an outburst of creative literature by making "a current of true and fresh ideas." He is a man whose outlook on life is at once broad and penetrating and who combines with a knowledge of conditions as they are a desire that the best ideals may be made prevalent in the life about him. In Arnold's well known words, "Criticism is a disinterested endeavor to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world."

It is worth while to look a little more closely into the work done by Arnold himself in carrying out the ideas set forth in this essay and especially to understand what may be called the critical method adopted by him. I am not now concerned with the conclusions reached by him—with his views of theology or society—but only with the critical method he adopted. He considered that one of the greatest obstacles to the progress of the English people was their conservatism and self-conceit. He found this self-esteem throughout the writings of Macaulay, who was the best representative of English Philistinism. In the essay already referred to he quotes from two speeches of members of parliament to show the danger of self-esteem: "Talk of the improved breed! Why, the race we ourselves represent, the men

and women, the old Anglo-Saxon race, are the best breed in the whole world.....The absence of a too enervating climate, too unclouded skies, and the too luxurious nature, has produced so vigorous a race of people, and has rendered us so superior to all the world." And again, says Mr. Roebuck, "I look around me and ask what is the state of England? Is not property safe? Is not every man able to say what he likes? Can you not walk from one end of England to the other in perfect security? I ask you whether, the world over or in past history, there is anything like it? Nothing. I pray that our unrivalled happiness may last." Arnold thought that such flattery of the people was inimical to progress. He says: "Now obviously, there is a peril for poor human nature in the words and thoughts of such exuberant self-satisfaction, until we find ourselves safe in the streets of the Celestial City." Far more useful, he thinks, are the words of Goethe: "The little that is done seems nothing when we look forward and see how much we have yet to do."

By the side of such bombastic utterances Arnold is fond of placing a clipping from some newspaper that served to indicate something of the immense tragedy of English life—its ignorance, its crime, and its Philistinism. He believes with Spinoza that the two great banes of humanity are self-conceit and the laziness coming from self-conceit. "The right conclusion certainly is that we should try, as far as we can, to make up our short-comings; and that to this end, instead of always fixing our thoughts upon the point in which our literature, and our intellectual life generally, are strong, we should from time to time, fix them upon those in which they are weak, and so learn to perceive clearly what we have to amend." He writes to his mother: "However, one cannot change English ideas as much as, if I live, I hope to change them, without saying imperturbably what one thinks, and making a good many people uncomfortable." In accordance with this idea he endeavored to indicate the weak points in English life—sometimes writing with a pleasant urbanity of style, again with trenchant satire and at times with prophetic vehemence. Before we congratulate ourselves upon the unparalleled material prosperity of modern times, would it not be well to see to what extent it has resulted in the deadening of spiritual faculties? The vast development of modern science "the crude unre-

generate strength intellect"—may possibly lead to a weakening of certain faculties of the human soul that will be disastrous. The British constitution, which in the minds of many politicians solves all problems in the world and out of it, may after all be but "a colossal machine for the manufacture of Philistines." The unparalleled development of the non-conformist sects may lead only to the narrower and more intense Puritan conception of life—religion may become materialized and reduced to formulæ and lifeless organizations. In a well known passage in "Culture and Anarchy" Arnold characterizes the three classes of English society—the aristocrats, the middle class and the masses—as Barbarians, Philistines, Populace. He undoubtedly exaggerates the defects of all these classes, and like Carlyle and Ruskin overstates the dangers of modern life. It cannot be denied, however, that such criticism is absolutely essential for the genuine and enduring progress of the people. It needs to be reckoned with, when a spirit of self-complacent optimism prevails.

Another obstacle to the progress of the English people was provincialism. Arnold found in English life a tendency to under-rate the strong points of other nations. He believed that the only wise thing was that England should keep in vital touch with the nations of Europe, and that in this way her crudeness and eccentricity of literary judgment, as well as her deficiency in many of the elements of contemporary Europe, might be remedied. "By the very nature of things, as England is not all the world, much of the best that is known and thought in the world cannot be of English growth, must be foreign; by the nature of things, again, it is just this that we are the least likely to know, while English thought is streaming in upon us from all sides, and takes excellent care that we should not be ignorant of its existence. The English critic of literature, therefore, must dwell much on foreign thought, and with particular heed on any part of it, which, significant and fruitful in itself, is for any reason specially likely to escape him."

In Arnold's work as literary critic he did much to carry on the work of Carlyle and Coleridge in acquainting the English people with the literature and thought of Germany, but his special work was in bringing about a better appreciation of French literature and French life. The English people since the French

Revolution had been inclined to disregard the literature of France, for it seemed to them an expression of a revolutionary spirit that was the exact opposite of all that England was attempting to accomplish. In the face of such prejudice Arnold wrote his essays on Sainte Beuve—his master in the art of criticism—George Sand, Amiel, the Literary Influence of Academies, Maurice and Eugenie de Guerin, and Joubert—these all viewed, not from the strictly literary point of view, but as affording insight into the most noteworthy characteristics of the French people. While aware of the honesty and energy of the English—the strong points of the national character—and also of the faults of the French, he yet paid many tributes to the open-mindedness, cosmopolitanism, and accessibility to ideas exhibited by the latter. More than the English, they seemed to him to be characterized by an open and clear mind, a quick and flexible intelligence. French reviews were of a higher order than English; so were French dictionaries and critical works. He saw “in the French literature of the eighteenth century, one of the most powerful, and pervasive intellectual agencies that had ever existed—the greatest European force of the eighteenth century.” As compared with French prose, English prose, even at its best, falls short in form, method, precision, proportion, arrangement. Nor did he confine his attention to French literature. As an inspector of schools for over thirty years Arnold sought to introduce into English educational work some of the best results that he had found in the French schools, just as, at a later time, President Eliot did the same thing for the colleges and universities of America.

With Arnold criticism had to do, however, not merely with the comparison of one country with another, it became the means of bringing about in both the individual and the nation the pursuit of perfection. He believed that the power of conduct, the power of intellect, the power of social life and manner, and the power of beauty should all be developed harmoniously, and that any man was onesided who developed any one of these faculties at the expense of the others. Culture was with him the development of the whole man, the harmonious expansion of all powers. And so that nation was to be most commended that sought to develop itself along all healthy lines of human activity. It must come to its best at all points. The English people had over-developed the Puri-

tan side of their nature at the expense of the Hellenic. He believed that their true greatness would be realized in the effort to realize the strong points in all the races that had entered into the making of the nation. "Then we may have the good of our German part, the good of our Latin part, the good of our Celtic part; and instead of one part fashioned with the other, we may bring it in to continue and perfect the other, when the other has given us all the good it can yield, and by being crushed further, could only give us its faulty excess. Then we may use the German faithfulness to nature to give us science, and to free us from insolence and self-will; we may use the Celtic quickness of perception to give us delicacy and to free us from hardness and Philistinism; we may use the Latin decisiveness to give us strenuous, clear method, and to free us from fumbling and idling." Throughout his works he is constantly drawing distinctions between different types of men and of races in order that he may show on the one hand their lack of balance, and on the other that he may inspire men with the desire to realize to some extent, at least, the strong points of men and races. He has given a searching analysis of the strong and weak points respectively of the Celt and the Teuton, showing that each race has much to learn from the other.

But the most notable study of this kind that he has made is in his presentation of Hellenism and Hebraism, "between which two points of influence moves the world." The pendulum of civilization has swung from one to the other; the Renaissance was a rebirth of Hellenism, and the Reformation (especially Puritanism) a revival of Hebraism. The Greek insisted on right thinking, the Hebrew on right acting; the ideal of the former was perfect intellectual vision, of the latter strictness of conscience; the dominant note in Greek civilization was freedom, in Hebrew a profound consciousness of sin and yearning for holiness. "Greece was the lifter-up of the banner of art and science, as Israel was the lifter-up of the banner of righteousness." Greece perished for lack of attention to conduct; for want of conduct, steadiness, character. But the Hebrew or the modern Puritan has much to learn from Plato and Homer and Aeschylus. England had Hebraism too much; and now men need to bring her face to face with Hellenic ideals. Arnold realizes and has briefly

stated the excellence of both these civilizations—he does ample justice to each, but while Hebraism is the more important, “neither is the law of human development, as their admirers are prone to make them; they are, each of them, *contributions* to human development—august contributions, invaluable contributions.” The best civilization will combine the strong points of both.

Such an outline may give some idea of Arnold’s way of criticising the English people. He has been very much misunderstood by those who have taken only a superficial glance at his work. There is undoubtedly some ground for the once general impression that he was a *dilettante* who wrote somewhat jauntily and superciliously of both literature and life. But one who reads his works closely must feel that at heart he was profoundly interested in the welfare of his people. No one who has read his letters, or knows the story of his long sustained efforts for the improvement of the schools of England, or who has read Prof. Gates’s admirable introduction to selections from his works, can fail to agree with the latter’s estimate that he was “one of the most self-sacrificingly laborious men of his time,” and that there was in him “no lack either of sincerity or of earnestness or of broad sympathy.” Beginning in his early life with a theory of poetry strikingly like that of the Greeks, he gradually became more and more interested in the perplexing problems of his age. Undoubtedly his poetry, giving expression as it does to the doubt and unrest of his age, and his essays in criticism, which must be placed high in any estimate of English literary criticism, will last longer than his discussions of social, political and religious questions of his day. But no one should undervalue the great influence that “Literature and Dogma” and “Culture and Anarchy” had in determining the intellectual life of his day. The poet Swinburne did not overstate the case when he said:

“It is doubtless the best and most direct service that a critic can do his countrymen to strip and smite their especial errors, to point out and fence off their peculiar pitfalls, and this Mr. Arnold has done for his English not once or twice only. I doubt if he has ever assailed or advised them without a cause; in one point above all he has done the most loyal and liberal service; he has striven to purge them of the pestilence of provincial

thought and tradition, of blind theory and brute opinion, of all that hereditary feeling of prejudice which substitutes self-esteem for self-culture, self-worship for self-knowledge; which clogs and encrusts all powers and all motions of the mind with a hard husk of mechanical conceit.....For the soul-sick British Philistine, sick of self-love, Arnold could have presented no better method of cure than study and culture of the French spirit, of its flexible intelligence and critical ambition, its many-sided faith in perfection, in possible excellence and ideal growth outward and upward, and the single-hearted love of all that which goes hand in hand with that faith."

A new country like America is in particular need of just this kind of criticism and of such critics as Arnold. The American people passed through what Lowell called the Fourth of July period of the national life, when there was much of self-glorification at the expense of honest and independent criticism. "When we met together," says Lowell, "it was to felicitate each other on our superiority to the rest of mankind.....Among the peoples of the earth we were the little Jack Horner. We had put in our thumbs and pulled out a plum, and the rest of mankind thought we were never tired of saying, 'What a good boy am I?'" We have been very sensitive to criticism, whether it came from such Englishmen as Dickens, Trollope, Matthew Arnold and James Bryce, or such critics of our own country as Cooper, Lowell, Curtis, Godkin and Norton. This sensitiveness to criticism is especially notable for many years in the formation of literary judgments. As a reaction from the time when all American literature was looked down upon by Americans, there came a period when everything American was exalted and magnified and when the inordinate desire to produce a literature caused critics to accept as literature very mediocre work. As Lowell said: "Criticism there was none, what assumed its functions was half provincial self-conceit, half patriotic resolve to find swans in birds of quite another species." It was at that period that Poe did such consummate service for American criticism. Although he manifested some bitterness against the worthier New England writers, he did much to establish proper ideals of art and to make possible a saner view of American literature.

In the South there is a particular need for the right kind of



criticism—criticism that will not be destructive, but constructive, that in the words of Arnold, will be a disinterested endeavor to learn and propagate the best that has been, and is being, thought and said in the world. The men who do this kind of work may expect to be met with a spirit of boastfulness and self-glorification that Arnold found in England. When a Southern writer speaks of the civilization of the Old South as "the sweetest, purest and most beautiful" in the history of the world, he needs to know something of other civilizations. A style of oratory has flourished in the South, that is peculiarly bombastic and rhetorical. It is difficult for a public speaker not to indulge in flattery. Even when there is an attempt at criticism the effect is likely to be destroyed by ministering to the self-satisfaction of the people. It will be necessary, if the best ideas are to prevail, to shatter many of the illusions of our people—to make them uncomfortable by the suggestion of what other people have done in many lines in which we are deficient.

One may still believe in the greatness of the Southern people—their past and present—and yet not be blind to undoubted limitations and defects. Such sensitiveness to criticism gives point to the question of a Northern paper as to whether the Southern people think they are a perfect people. One has heard so often from commencement platforms and in public gatherings of the glory of Southern chivalry and the beauty of Southern womanhood, that some men may be pardoned if taking all this for granted they insist on facts and conditions and hold up standards of excellence. Not so generally recognized, we need now, above all other times, to insist, not so much on what has been done, as on what remains to be done, in education, in literature, and in the development of a sounder ethical life. We need to ask ourselves uncomfortable questions and to face the answers heroically. How do the Southern statesmen of the present day compare with those of a former generation in progressiveness and breadth of sympathy and culture? How many ministers and editors are there in the Southern States who have national reputations or deserve to have them? How many highly endowed institutions of learning have we? With all our boasted universities how many really deserve the name? How many libraries,

museums, art galleries, publishing houses, magazines have we? To what extent is scholarship prized among us? Why is it that so many of our men of letters and scholars now live north of Mason and Dixon's line? Such questions and others like them can not be answered by evading the issue and talking of the strong points in Southern character. Only a discontent with things as they are and a knowledge of other people who are strong where we are weak will give us a desire for perfection.

It has become almost commonplace to say that the South is a provincial section, that it has been shut off from the great forces of the modern world. There are reasons for this that need not be rehearsed in this connection. Few people have ever had to suffer more from war, and poverty, and mistaken policies of government; but none of these things, however much they may explain the past, can justify the continuance of a point of view that will prevent us from reaping the results of modern progress. The South is a belated section. Few people ever had a better opportunity than we now have to avail ourselves of the experiences of other sections and other nations. Cosmopolitanism and open-mindedness on the part of our people, will enable us to progress at a rapid rate. And yet there are men who still insist that we keep out of the South any movement tending towards the adoption of modern ideas. Champions though we have been of the policy of free trade in government we are in danger of putting a protective tariff on ideas. A prominent leader of education in the Southern States expressed himself as directly opposed to an educational movement that must inevitably come in every civilized country, on the ground that it was inspired by Northern men. Opponents of certain tendencies in industrial life have insisted that child-labor laws and laws regulating hours of industry must be opposed because, forsooth, they have been adopted by the State of Massachusetts. A distinguished ecclesiastical officer recently warned a body of preachers against one of the most prominent professors of Yale University because of his alleged adoption of a modern point of view. It is encouraging to know that three hundred preachers heard the professor with gladness and adopted resolutions asking him to come again. Any man who dares to express himself in favor of certain ideas is likely to be told that they have sprung up in the North. The conservatives and pro-

vincials will undoubtedly do all they can to resist the inevitable progress of the Southern people, but they will surely be defeated. One of the most encouraging signs in contemporary Southern life is that Southern men and women are studying in the best universities of America and Europe and are coming back filled with the spirit of modern progress. Business men are even less provincial in accepting whatever may be for their best interests. "Docile echoes of the eternal voice, pliant organs of the infinite will, such workers are going along with the essential movement of the world; and this is their strength, and their happy and divine fortune."

The splendid opportunity that stands out before these men is that they may avoid the mistakes, as well as reap the benefits, of movements that have already spent themselves in other places. Southern colleges and universities, while adopting many of the educational reforms of such leaders as Presidents Eliot, Butler, and Harper, will avoid some of the extremes to which these men have gone. Religious leaders, while accepting the results of modern scholarship and criticism, will not make the mistake made in New England of a complete reaction against the established faith. In other words, the Southern people have the opportunity of catching on the rebound many of the most striking tendencies of modern life. Men who are wise enough to see this opportunity will not make the mistake of renouncing what is best and most enduring in the character of the Southern people, but upon this as a basis, will build the finer civilization of the future. They will welcome truth from whatever source it may come, whether it be from France, or Germany, or Italy, or Japan, or New England—most of all from those people who are most unlike ourselves.

The note of provincialism is seen most often, perhaps, in literary criticism. Since the war there has been a continually expressed demand that there should be a Southern literature. The South had gone down in defeat on the battlefield: writers should arise to plead her cause before the world. The answer to that demand came first in elaborate histories and biographies, and later—in a far less self-conscious way—in the writings of Cable and Harris, Page and Craddock, Johnston and James Lane Allen. It came in the excellent poetry of Sidney Lanier who had nothing of the

provincial in his makeup, but was a citizen of the modern world. These men have done a good work, but when one reads the criticism sometimes passed upon them by Southern admirers he knows that he is in Arnold's land of Philistia. No amount of boasting can give them the place in literature they desire. Their work must meet the test demanded of all men who strive for literary excellence. To set up false standards is detrimental to art.

North Carolina is not represented in this band of post-bellum Southern writers; but recently some of her loyal critics have heralded the coming of Rev. Thomas Dixon, Jr., into the ranks of the world's authors. I have a newspaper clipping that has the following astounding statement: "This brilliant and erratic man will go down in history as the greatest literary genius of his age." One of the most deplorable facts in contemporary American life is the notoriety of this same writer. Compared with the best Southern writers even—to say nothing of Scott and Thackeray and Dickens—he does not deserve to be recognized in the world of literature. "Red Rock," by Thomas Nelson Page, deals with the same period as does "The Leopard's Spots;" it represents graphically, and at times artistically, the terrible experiences of the Southern people in reconstruction times, but there is moderation about it; the touch of the gentleman and the artist is in evidence. One knows not whether to deplore more the execrable art of "The Leopard's Spots"—sensational, vulgar, commonplace—or the moral point of view, its envenomed fury against the negro. I have not read "The One Woman," but it is no less than a miracle if the author of "The Leopard's Spots," could in one year evolve to the point where he writes even a third-rate novel.

Critics of Southern life—men who see conditions as they are and try to reconstruct Southern life—are not the enemies of the South. They may seem to be at times destructive and irreverent. Some of them are, but others are striving for the good of the people and ask only an opportunity for doing their work. It has been said of some of them that they are writing and speaking that they may be heard in the North. Their motives have been misunderstood. In 1892 the late Prof. Baskervill wrote an article on Southern literature in which he stated in a scholarly,

thoroughly scientific way, the reasons for a lack of literature in the old South. The editor of a Southern review criticised him severely, claiming that he had written the article to please Northern critics. Sensitiveness to criticism is bad enough when the critic is some Northern man who writes what he thinks of Southern conditions, it is deplorable when the critic is a Southern man anxious to do service for his section. Mr. Walter Page's address on "The Forgotten Man," instead of provoking discussion of the question as to whether the facts were not at least partially true, brought upon him a world of abuse; he had only the desire to help the people who criticized him. More men are needed of this type—statesmen who will "bring thought to politics and saturate politics with thought;" preachers who will bring to their work something of the vital glow of men who have seen a new heaven and a new earth; editors who will cast their eyes out over the whole world for ideas and movements that may be of service to their readers; scholars who will know no sectionalism in the pursuit of truth—men in all professions who will be at once heirs of the ages and citizens of the world.

## The Removal of Legal and Political Disabilities, 1868—1898

By J. G. DeR. HAMILTON

The disabilities here alluded to were imposed during a period extending from 1862 to 1867. The first was in May, 1862, when the test oath, commonly known as the "Iron Clad Oath," was prescribed for all who were entering upon the duties of any office under the United States government. It was as follows:

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have never borne arms voluntarily against the United States since I have been a citizen thereof; that I have voluntarily given no aid, countenance, council, or encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostility thereto; that I have neither sought nor accepted nor attempted to exercise the functions of any office whatever, under any authority or pretended authority, in hostility to the United States; that I have not yielded a voluntary support to any pretended government, authority, power, or court within the United States, hostile or inimical thereto. And I do further swear (or affirm) that to the best of my knowledge and ability, I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, that I take this obligation freely and without mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God." This was passed with but little if any opposition as a necessary measure in time of war. In June of the same year a similar oath was prescribed for all jurors in United States courts.

During the year 1866 disabilities were imposed by the fourteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States, section 3, by the various acts, commonly called the reconstruction acts, and by a bill which became a law July 28th, 1866. The latter was in regard to service in the army and navy of those who had participated in the war on the confederate side. It was not properly a legal or political disability, but it seems well to mention it as part of the general policy of the government in recon-

struction, and also as an example of the continuance of that policy. It was to this effect:

"No person who has served in any capacity in the military, naval or civil service of the so-called Confederate States, or of either of the States in insurrection during the rebellion, shall be appointed to any position in the army or navy of the United States."

The disqualifying clause of the reconstruction acts was:

"An act to provide for a more efficient government of the rebel states, Sec. 5. No person excluded from the privilege of holding office by the proposed Amendment to the Constitution shall be eligible as a member of convention, nor shall such person vote for members." This became a law, March 2nd, 1867.

A supplementary act to the above provided an oath in addition: "I ———; do solemnly swear (or affirm) in the presence of Almighty God, that I am a citizen of the State of ———; that I am twenty-one years old; that I have not been disfranchised for participation in any rebellion or Civil War against the United States, nor for felony committed against the laws of any state or of the United States; that I have never been a member of any state legislature, nor held any executive or judicial office in any state and afterwards engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof; that I have never taken an oath as a member of Congress of the United States, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as any executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, and afterward engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof; that I will faithfully support the Constitution and obey the laws of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, encourage others so to do, so help me God." This was passed, as were the other reconstruction acts, over the President's veto and became a law, March 23rd, 1867.

A third act, which became a law, July 19th, 1867, gave definite interpretation to the above. It was in part:

"No person who has been a member of the legislature of any State, or who has held executive or judicial office in any State, whether he has taken an oath to support the Constitution of the

United States or not, and whether he was holding such office at the commencement of the rebellion, or had held it before, and who has afterwards engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof, is entitled to be registered or to vote; and the words 'executive or judicial office in any State' in said oath mentioned shall be construed to include all civil officers created by law for the administration of any general law of a State, or for the administration of justice.

"No person shall at any time be entitled to be registered or to vote by reason of any executive pardon or amnesty for any act or thing, which, without such pardon or amnesty, would disqualify him from registering or voting."

As is seen, as the functions of a State were resumed all disabilities imposed by act of Congress were removed. The arguments for the above provisions were, in the main, the same as were brought forward in the debate on the constitutional amendment and will be treated later. One, however, may be mentioned. The opponents of the reconstruction policy of congress maintained that the effect of this legislation in the States affected would be to crush the whites under negro domination, and that irreparable injury would be accomplished in this way.

The majority in congress were in no humor to listen to the arguments of the opposition, even if their minds had not already been made up on the subject and all opposition was without effect except to increase the feeling of bitterness which was already growing up in the South. The exclusion of those who had participated in the war from the polls and conventions was very heartily approved by those in the North who thought the amendment was too lenient.

The disabilities which form the main subject of this investigation were those imposed by the third section of the fourteenth amendment. As first reported to the house and passed this was as follows:

"Until the 4th day of July in the year 1870, all persons who voluntarily adhered to the late insurrection, giving it aid and comfort, shall be excluded from the right to vote for Representatives in Congress and for electors for president and vice-president of the United States."



The amendment as a whole was the subject of a long series of debates. The section defining citizenship was probably given more attention than the rest, but the clause imposing disabilities was the cause of a very heated argument. In the debate in the house much dissatisfaction was felt and expressed by members of both parties. Many of the majority felt that the measure was far too lenient. Mr. Stevens said, "The third section will be the most popular among the people. My objection is that it is far too lenient. I know there is a morbid sensibility sometimes called mercy, which affects a few of all classes from the priest to the clown, which has more sympathy for the murderer on the gallows than for his victim. I hope I have a heart as capable of feeling for human woe as others. But I never dreamed that all punishment would be dispensed with in human society. I would be glad to see the limit extended to 1876 or even 1976 and include all State and municipal elections. In my judgment we do not sufficiently protect the loyal men of the rebel States from the vindictive persecutions of their rebel neighbors."

Others of the republican members claimed that it would be an impossibility to enforce it. The democrats took this up and, in addition, argued that it was an *ex post facto* law and consequently unconstitutional. They also claimed that it was unjust and oppressive after proclamations of amnesty. This produced a discussion as to what effect the various proclamations of the President would have upon the operation of the amendment. Mr. Blaine led in the movement which brought the house to the definite conclusion that the presidential pardon could have no effect as that applied only to punishment for crime, and that the deprivation of political privilege could in no sense be regarded as such a punishment as it was merely a preventive of further disloyal acts. It seems probable that the passage of this section would have failed had the opposition of the minority been lacking. This had a tendency to solidify the majority and the section was passed. In the debate Mr. Garfield opposed the measure. He said,

"If the proposition had been that those who had been in rebellion should be ineligible to any office under the government of the United States, or as electors of president and vice-president, or that all who had borne arms were declared forever incapable of

voting for a United States officer, it would, in my judgment, be far more defensible.....If they are not worthy to vote in January, 1870, will they be worthy in July of that year. If the franchise were withheld until they should perform some specific act of loyalty, it would commend itself as a principle. What is worse, it will be said everywhere that this is purely a piece of political management in reference to a presidential election.....Are you prepared to make the South a vast camp for four years more? I am sure that no member of the house will think that I say this with the least desire to favor or excuse the men who have been in arms against the government."

Mr. Farnsworth said, "If they are to be disfranchised at all it should be for a longer period. Besides there is a large class of men, both in the North and South, equally and more guilty than the misguided men who will be disfranchised by this provision. I allude to those politicians in the South, who keeping out of danger, set on the ignorant and brave to fight for their rights, and to other politicians, editors, and copper-heads in the North, some of whom were and are members of congress, who encouraged them and discouraged our soldiers. I would prefer a change which would disqualify leaders from any office under the United States."

The democratic members had little chance to say anything in the general debate and merely expressed their disapproval. When the bill for the amendment of the constitution, as passed by the house, reached the senate, the third section was at once amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of president or vice-president, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have taken part in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a two-thirds vote of each house remove such disability."

Mr. Howard, of Michigan, was the chief supporter of the change. Mr. Hendricks led the opposition to the measure. He

offered an amendment which would make the disabilities rest only upon those who were holding office at the outbreak of the war but it was defeated as were all other amendments offered.

There can be no doubt that the action of congress in imposing these disabilities was in accord with the feeling of the North as a whole. The ratification to an extent shows this but there was a deeper feeling than merely this would indicate. Many persons in public and private life believed with Mr. Stevens that enough had not been done either as a punishment or as a measure for further safety, and many others agreed with them.

A very noticeable thing is the fact that the democrats preferred the Howard amendment rather than the original section. Mr. Blaine said that it was inexplicable, but it was evidently merely an indication of the notion in which the democrats were indulging that, with the aid of the Southern vote, they could obtain a sufficient majority in congress at the next election to remove all disabilities.

It is impossible to obtain definite information in regard to the number of persons affected by this law. The estimates in the debate ranged from two thousand to three hundred thousand. The latter was possibly nearer the mark but it was far beyond it so far as can be judged.

Before the fourteenth amendment had been ratified by the States, a movement for the removal of disabilities commenced. The first case that was acted on by either house came up in January, 1868, and was for the removal of disabilities from Governor R. M. Patton, of Alabama. Although the bill for his relief failed on account of not being acted on by the house, it was, in a way, a test case and was introduced as such by the committee. It was the subject of quite extensive debate in the senate. Messrs. Buckalew, Johnson, and Hendricks opposed it on account of the method. Mr. Johnson consistently favored general amnesty. Mr. Buckalew said:

"While just yet I am not in favor of general amnesty, I am always ready to vote for the relief of persons who have shown devotion to the government."

Mr. Hendricks said:

"I am in favor of relieving that man who now is willing to hold up the authority of the government, to maintain its dignity

and power, and to obey its laws whether he goes with you politically or me politically. The honest citizen who stands by his duty to his country, whatever may be his political views, his conscientious judgment upon the important questions of the time, I am in favor of restoring; and I am not going to inquire in the senate when I am asked to restore a man to political position and influence whether he goes with me politically or against me. I am going to ask simply, is he now true to his country; in the sentiment of Mr. Lincoln's proclamation of 1863, will he now swear to support the Constitution of the United States and be a true man to his country. I think the restoration ought to be on some general proposition. I would favor a general law and would vote for it but I cannot for single cases. I do not believe in the amendment or the reconstruction policy. Why should this man be relieved? He is guilty of treason. Because he is in favor of the reconstruction laws. I am not."

Mr. Davis said he could not vote for such a man because he was a double traitor and there was no assurance that he would not be a triple one.

Mr. Drake argued that the time had not yet come for any such removal. He said:

"I cannot vote for this bill now for the simple reason that the time has not yet, in my judgment, arrived when you can judge the sincerity of any rebels' repentance by his works. It is easy for rebels now, prior to the work of reconstruction, to make these manifestations in order to reinstate their political privileges in the reconstructed States and then turn and leave us the moment they have got into that position. I cannot, knowing rebels as I do, consent to vote for relief to any individual who at this present is under the disabilities which our law prescribes."

Mr. Pomeroy and Mr. Stewart voiced the sentiments of the majority of the Republican members. The former said:

"I know of no reason we can assign for continuing disabilities upon persons who are now willing to unite with our friends in the system of reconstruction we have provided. Why should we want to entail disabilities upon persons who are willing to co-operate with us now and for all time to come?"

Mr. Stewart who introduced the bill said that it was the beginning of an effort to secure the co-operation of the whites in

reconstruction. He was willing to grant amnesty to all who were repentant. Mr. Howard was of the same opinion but insisted on "fruits meet for repentance."

The debate established one thing very conclusively, namely, that for the present the senate would not consider the application of anyone for the removal of disabilities who was not acting with the republican party.

Just at this time the judiciary committee of the senate and the reconstruction committee of the house were in charge of all applications and suggestions for the removal of disabilities. We shall see how the system was altered later.

Roderick R. Butler, of Tennessee, was the first person to have his disabilities removed. He had been elected to the house and could not take his seat as he had been a member of the legislature of Tennessee during the war. There was much opposition to the removal of his disabilities and the debate on the subject was very bitter, but a two-thirds vote of each house was secured. The debate was almost entirely a discussion of the personal character of Mr. Butler and his record. The case is only worthy of mention because it was the first.

The most important bill of the session (40th Cong. 2nd Sess.) was one relieving nearly a thousand persons, the majority of whom were from North Carolina. Another principle was here established: that only upon a signed application would the removal of disabilities be considered. This was not always adhered to as there were several cases where it was dispensed with. But the general feeling was that amnesty should not be thrust upon anyone. The democrats made the fact that all the persons included in the bill were republicans the basis of their argument against the bill. In reply Mr. Wilson said:

"In voting to remove political disabilities I do not require that the person relieved shall be a believer in my political faith or a supporter of my political principles. However, support of the ever loyal republican party affords to congress and the world ample evidence of the abandonment of the fatal principles of the rebellion and I am ready to remove the disabilities of such a rebel."

The democrats still clung to the vain and foolish hope that the fourteenth amendment would not be ratified or would be declared unconstitutional. Mr. Buckalew led the opposition in the

senate. He claimed that it was a usurpation of executive power for congress to remove disabilities. He said:

"I would vote for a bill which removed disabilities as a general rule, leaving some particular exceptions, because in substance that would be repealing your former laws. I am willing to vote for anything which is in the nature of a repealing statute but for no bill which in its nature is a dispensing statute."

Mr. Howard was somewhat doubtful of the propriety of the measure and urged protection from red-handed rebels. Mr. Buckalew said:

"The Senator from Michigan would prefer to select for his clemency those red-handed and horrible rebels who are likely to vote for him, possibly to give him success in the elections of the present year. While he is selecting red-handed rebels for congressional clemency, I would choose that he should select a little from both sides so that there should not be any disturbance in the effect on our national politics. I grant the senator from Michigan if my political friends were in power and were administering a system of this kind they would do the same thing but it is the system that I am opposed to."

The names included in the bill were from those recommended by the constitutional convention of the various Southern States. In all many thousands had been recommended but the committee had cut down the number to about a thousand. The names of many quite prominent men were in the list as finally submitted to congress. Among them was General Longstreet. As might have been expected his name produced much discussion but he was championed by quite a number of the party leaders and his disabilities were removed. Not long afterwards he was appointed Collector of the Port of New Orleans. His case was cited as a precedent for the removal of disabilities until the general removal in 1872.

Without relief such as this bill offered North Carolina and Georgia could not have been reorganized. By degrees it became a settled policy to remove the disabilities of all persons elected to office if there was no very strong objection to them personally and if they were recommended by republican members. Many democrats were now relieved in this way.

During the debate on this bill an amendment was proposed

which would remove all the disabilities imposed by the fourteenth amendment. In regard to this Mr. Coburn of Indiana said:

"Universal amnesty is universal insanity, universal anarchy, universal ruin."

General Logan said that in view of the fact that the republican platform had advocated removing disabilities from those giving evidence of loyalty, it should be done. The republican platform of 1868 had the following section in its plank on reconstruction:

"We favor the removal of the disqualifications and restrictions imposed upon the late rebels in the same measure as the spirit of disloyalty will die out, and as may be consistent with the safety of the loyal people."

Several other bills were discussed and passed at this session. The debates have little importance and need not be considered here. A quotation from General Garfield is interesting. An objection was made to the application of certain persons on the ground that they had participated in rebellion. He said:

"Do gentlemen expect that we will ever be called upon to pass any bill of this character that is unnecessary? I am sure that those who wish to restore the rebel States safely and speedily, will, whenever the committee have reported a bill, be ready to support the committee. So far as I know the men who fought against the rebellion in the field are among the most willing to bring back to the privilege of citizenship all who are sincerely desirous to support what they once attempted to destroy. General Scott said, 'When this war is ended it will require all the force of the nation to restrain the fury of the now combatants.'"

In all during this session disabilities were removed from about fifteen hundred persons. Several bills introduced failed to pass one house or the other, or the number would have been several times as great.

The third session of the fortieth congress had very many bills for the removal of disabilities introduced but little was accomplished. Both houses seemed inclined to take much time in their consideration. Much distrust was expressed of the method employed to obtain knowledge of the character of the persons to be relieved. In spite of the fact that nearly fifty bills of this kind

were introduced, only three were passed. These relieved forty-one persons, the majority of whom were newly elected officers in the various Southern States.

Democratic policy in regard to the matter was being formed this session. It seems to have been decided to take what it was possible for the party to get and the majority of the democrats voted for all bills for relief while protesting at the method employed and the policy of the majority. A few, like Mr. Salisbury and Mr. Brooks, said that they would vote in opposition to the relief of all who were acting with the republicans. Mr. Buckalew also constantly protested against the exercise of the power in the way it was done. In reply to him Mr. Stewart said:

"The committee have endeavored as best they could to ascertain that those whom they propose to relieve are, 1st, good citizens, of good moral standing in the communities where they live; and 2nd, that they are in favor of the constitution and the laws of congress and are willing to obey them and are not preaching to their neighbors that those laws are usurpations and that it is not their duty to obey them." Many of the republicans argued that it was not yet time to remove disabilities.

Mr. Fessenden said in reply to these:

"Now, sir, for myself, I have been in favor of giving that power in congress a very liberal interpretation, and if reasonable evidence was offered that men really were disposed to be good citizens and do their duty, and had committed no very flagrant offenses, I have thought it would be good policy to relieve them as fast as we could and do away with the distinctions thus made."

At the first session of the forty-first congress, the senate appointed a committee on the removal of political disabilities. The judiciary committee which had charge of this work previously was over-worked to handle the rapidly increasing number of applications for relief. Over ten thousand were submitted at this session alone. The senate wished a joint committee of both houses but the house would not agree. In consequence many bills after passage by one house failed of passage or were not acted on in the other.

Mr. Ferry, of Connecticut, introduced a bill for the removal of disabilities in general and advocated it strongly. Congress, how-



ever, was not ready for any such measure, but a movement toward the general removal of disabilities with possibly a few exceptions was beginning. Many in both houses expressed the wish not to relieve anyone or to relieve all. The most violent opposition to relief came as might be expected from Southern republicans, many of whom saw in the adoption of this measure a certainty of their retirement from public life. But a number of these men, favored a general bill. As it was no action of any kind was taken during the session. By this time democrats were in many instances being relieved, though naturally not to the same extent as republicans.

The next session of congress saw many of both parties included in the twelve bills which were passed relieving about three thousand two hundred persons. What was known as Senate Bill No. 436 gave rise to a great deal of discussion. Mr. Stewart moved as an amendment, a clause removing disabilities from all persons (except members of congress, United States judges, and officers of the army and navy who afterwards joined the rebellion) who should file an application for relief at any United States court, the same to take effect upon ratification of the fifteenth amendment. He said:

"I believed from the first that the true settlement was universal suffrage and universal amnesty. Now we have universal suffrage let us close reconstruction and have universal amnesty. It will come whether we grant it or not. It will be an issue when it does come and when it comes by a contest before the people. It will bring into power a class of men who will not protect the rights of the people we have sought to protect. It will bring rebels into power. It is their stock in trade. One rebel in that situation has more power than ten or one hundred with their disabilities removed." He also said later. "It is most important that congress should not constitute itself a tribunal for special pardons. The whole matter of dispensing special pardons had better be postponed altogether and no more of these bills passed until the state of the country is such that a general bill should pass, or this amendment had better be passed now."

It is interesting to note the difference in feeling between the house and the senate. The attitude of the house showed that it would soon reach the point of being ready to grant universal

amnesty. This was, of course, due to their being more immediately representative of the people and the general sentiment of the people was that some step should be taken in the matter at once.

Messrs. Farnsworth, Voorhees, and Morgan (of Ohio), Beck, Butler, and Cox took the most conspicuous part in the discussion of the subject in the house. Nevertheless in spite of the apparent willingness of the majority to remove disabilities in general, all propositions to do so came to nothing. More bills in regard to relief of this kind were introduced than at any previous session (185 in both houses.)

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

## The Practical Value of Modern Language Study in the Secondary School

BY JOHN CHRISTIAN RANSMEIER, PH. D.,  
Professor of German in Trinity College

An examination of the schemes of study in the high school departments of such representative and prosperous Southern cities as Columbia, S. C., Charlotte, N. C., Savannah, Ga., and Memphis, Tenn., reveals the fact that during the scholastic year 1902-1903 no French or German whatever was taught. A glance at corresponding schedules of Medina, Herkimer, Lyons and Fulton, villages in the State of New York having respectively populations of 4,700, 5,500, 4,300 and 5,200, shows a very different status. At Medina a course of two years, at Lyons and Fulton courses of three years in each of the languages, were offered. The high school department of Herkimer gave an opportunity for a two years' course of instruction in French and a three years' course in German.

I state the condition of matters at these various points, because it illustrates very well the comparative amount of attention that is bestowed upon the modern languages in many of the high schools of the South and in those of New York. I do not intend at this time to investigate the cause of the neglect of these branches in many of our better schools; but this much I desire to say emphatically, that very frequently it is in no wise due to a lack of interest or of knowledge as to what constitutes a first-class school curriculum on the part of the superintendents and principals. Sometimes the obstacle is in troublesome local conditions which they may not heretofore have been able to control. It is my purpose, therefore, to present an analysis of the significance of French and German instruction in the secondary school, hoping that it may somewhat supplement the efforts of those who are faithfully and energetically laboring to elevate and round out the curriculums of our high schools, both public and private.

The present article will discuss the practical, or more accurately, the tool-value, of the modern languages, i. e. their value

*as mere instruments*, taking no account of them for their own sake or as disciplinary agencies in the development of mind and character. Such a use is that which the merchant makes of them in securing patronage, or the physician in studying the writings of foreign medical experts. In a subsequent paper, I shall examine the disciplinary value of the French and German languages—for the discussion will be confined to these—considering them as instrumentalities for the development of mind and character.

The present is a time of great activity in theological research. Every minister who desires to keep abreast of modern thought must read German. The storm-centre of such investigation is to be found in Germany, and the great bulk of important publications dealing with this subject is in German, and is not available in translation. It goes without saying that the believer in higher criticism must continue to inform himself, for modern investigation is so active that its results are in a constant state of transition. The man who does not believe in the validity of the conclusions drawn should certainly know what it is all about. For how shall one contend with an enemy concerning whom he knows nothing? But without question there are higher critics of great intelligence, who are at the same time very devout men. These scholars may possibly be of great service to the minister in strengthening him for his lofty calling; and even if they were all actively opposed to the Christian faith, which is by no means the case, our ministers should know what they are teaching. John Wesley knew French and read Voltaire and Rousseau in his rides through the country lanes of England. He was able also to read Spanish and German, and to speak German as well. Today the knowledge of the modern languages—especially German—is more valuable to the minister than in any preceding age. I take the liberty of quoting from a letter written to me by Dean Tillett of the Biblical Department of Vanderbilt University in response to an inquiry in regard to the value of modern language study to the young minister, "Germany is the theological workshop of the world. The preacher who has a good working knowledge of the German language has access to a large and rich literature which is entirely unknown and lost to him who is without such knowledge. What a knowledge of New Testament Greek is to the student of the Bible, a knowledge of German is to the student of

modern Christian theology. To be well equipped the preacher must know both." Moreover distorted notions of the results of the higher criticism are sifting down among the masses of the church, and will continue to do so in an increasing degree. Further—and more important still—the alert and intelligent young men of the church are going to put a great many questions. They are doing so now. As one who loves the church and prays that there may be "peace within her gates and prosperity within her palaces," as one who has seen during a somewhat extended observation among the active and intelligent young minds of the country the decreasing hold of the church upon its strongest young men, I desire to say emphatically that our ministers must know about these things. But how shall they inform themselves? Obviously the men who go to schools of theology directly from secondary schools must get this power in the latter, or go without it. And the men who go to college will reap even greater advantage from having begun their modern languages in the high school.

It is now universally admitted by those best qualified to speak upon the subject that a good reading knowledge of French and German is of great importance to the physician. The question is not can we afford thus to train our future physicians, but can we afford not to train them in these branches. As in the case of our clergymen, many of our prospective physicians go to the professional schools directly from the high school. If the secondary schools do not give them these languages, the people must pay the penalty. Again, the young man who goes to college is helped even more, for he can use his knowledge of French and German in his scientific studies, a field where it is indispensable if one is to secure the best results. At any moment the life of the one nearest and dearest to us in all the world may be in the hands of a practitioner who is ten or fifteen years behind the times because he cannot go to the fountains of knowledge, but must wait until the healing waters slowly spread over the world and reach his secluded nook. Simply because an acquaintance with these idioms is necessary for the best results, the splendid medical department of Johns Hopkins University has from its beginning required a reading knowledge of French and German for entrance. I quote from a note written to me by Acting Dean Wm. H. Welch in

response to an inquiry relative to the value of French and German to the physician: "A large part of the best literature in medicine is in these languages, and it is impossible for a physician to keep thoroughly abreast with advances in the science and art of medicine without a reading knowledge of French and German."

Let us recall a few facts of every-day knowledge to show the importance of foreign medical research. Hahnemann, the founder of the homeopathic system of medicine, was a German. In our own day, Dr. Robert Koch has laid the foundation of scientific bacteriology. He has also given a great impulse to the treatment of disease by serums. Prof. Koch is the discoverer of the bacillus of tuberculosis, and has made the protection of a community against the terrible scourge of consumption a much simpler matter, because we now know just what the danger is and where to fight it. This is strikingly illustrated by an editorial on the subject of "The Extinction of Tuberculosis" in *American Medicine* for April 4, 1903, from which I quote: "In a capital lecture on this subject published in the English journal *Public Health* of March, Dr. Alfred Hillier gives a striking chart showing that at the present rate of decrease in the deaths from pulmonary tuberculosis Prussia will reach the zero point about the year 1927.....The rapid fall in the Prussian rate is ascribed to (1) the precautions against infectious diseases due to the discovery of the tubercle bacillus; (2) the improved condition of the working classes caused by the workmen's state insurance laws; (3) the establishment of sanitariums." Koch's researches have also resulted in the discovery of the bacillus of cholera. Pasteur did distinguished service in the field of bacteriology, gave a great impetus to the production of serums, and himself produced a serum for the treatment of hydrophobia, which is now accounted the most trustworthy remedy. A German, Prof. Rudolph Virchow, was the founder of modern cellular pathology, which is the basis of all pathology of the present practitioner. These names every one knows, but there are literally hundreds of investigators whose researches are known only to the scientist, upon the knowledge of the results of whose investigations your life or mine may at any moment depend. To illustrate this, take up Sternberg's *Bacteriology*, a work by an American, and turn to the article on the bacillus of diphtheria. We find reference to the research of

the discoverer of the bacillus, Klebs, the first isolator, Loeffler, further to that of Welch, Abbott, Gram, Weigert, Roux, Yersin, Fraenkel and Brieger. The discoverer of the serum for the treatment of diphtheria was Behring. The French and German names decidedly preponderate. This is not an isolated case. The results of the researches of French and German investigators are always essential. I have been repeatedly told by American physicians that the Germans are the best diagnosticians in the world. It is at least true that they are eminent and that we cannot disregard them.

In surgical matters, too, we can learn a great deal from foreign practitioners. We have had a recent illustration in the work of Prof. Roentgen, as a result of whose investigations it has become possible to use the so-called x-ray in finding concealed foreign objects in the human body. We have had a very sensational demonstration of foreign surgery in the operations for congenital hip disease by Dr. Lorenz, the Viennese surgeon. Few foreign physicians, however, have the time and inclination to come over for our instruction. We must go to them. But how shall we do so? Not necessarily by crossing the water. That is not always possible. Listen to a bit of testimony from Dr. Lorenz on this subject. He writes in the *New York Independent* of December 25, 1902: "I am greatly pleased to find in New York that my methods of operating are well understood and practiced. In the West they are not. But here in New York where the German medical papers are taken and studied, the surgeons of the Hospital for the Ruptured and Crippled know as much about my operation as I do myself. They have been practicing it for about six years." Permit me to suggest at this point that the public schools of New York City now make it possible to study German for five forty-minute periods a week for five years. I have a note from Superintendent Herrin, of Herkimer, N. Y., which had a population of 5,500 at the last census, in which he informs me that the amount of modern language study in their high school—two years of French and three of German—is the ordinary amount in places of from five to ten thousand inhabitants. A considerable investigation on my part confirms this statement. There can be no doubt that we see here in large measure the explanation of the fact that in New York *the German medical papers are*

*taken and studied.* I maintain that the best physicians are not too good for the South, and that we cannot permit ourselves to suffer this disadvantage.

In journalism, too, I believe a sound knowledge of the modern languages to be of great use. This is the case especially for all those who write editorials upon matters pertaining to international politics. Every journal worthy of the name has such articles from time to time. A knowledge of the character of the people concerned and of their manner of looking at things would add greatly to the value of editorial expression. Indeed it is quite conceivable that a journalism uninformed in regard to these matters should fail to comprehend the purposes of a foreign power and should so misrepresent it as to bring on very hurtful friction and even war. Many believe that ignorance on our part of the true position of the Spanish government, and on their part ignorance of the true position of our government, brought on the Spanish war, and that the liberation of Cuba could have been accomplished by peaceful means. A still more recent illustration is to be found in the attitude of the American press toward Germany and the German emperor. I believe that a careful observer with the facts before him must decide that the German government is making strenuous efforts to promote friendship with us, and is in no wise striving to do us injury. The German emperor sees the question in its true light. He knows that mutual knowledge will produce mutual friendship, and that friendship is worth more than constant strife. Accordingly he has lately caused the gymnasiums, the German secondary schools, to devote considerably more attention to the study of English. Furthermore, since so many of our citizens are of foreign origin—one in ten has at least one parent a native German—a knowledge of foreign languages and literatures would help the journalist better to understand our own population. For let us remember that a command of literature brings with it a considerable knowledge of the people concerned.

In commerce, too, the familiarity with French and German is going to be especially valuable. French is proverbially the traveler's language, and is spoken almost everywhere. It is a sort of international linguistic clearing-house for educated men. Thus Jowett once asked a young man what was written over the door



of the Inferno. Upon being answered by a quotation of Dante's line, he replied that this was entirely incorrect and that the inscription really is *Ici on parle français*. The German language also is of great commercial value. We are even now finding an excellent market for a variety of products in the Fatherland. And the Germans are an aggressively expansive nation; the population is increasing annually by approximately 600,000 inhabitants. Very many must, therefore, emigrate. Emigration means colonists, and colonists mean trade. During the late Venezuelan complications, the reports in the newspapers stated that there were already more than a million Germans in Brazil. In the Levant and in Asia Minor, the influence of this nation has been constantly increasing. We have all noticed its aggressiveness in China. The German navy is growing with extreme rapidity in size and efficiency. We have within the boundaries of the United States more than six million inhabitants both of whose parents are native Germans, and more than eight million who have at least one German parent. It is, therefore, clear that a knowledge of their language is of great commercial importance.

The Germans have long recognized the profitableness of a knowledge of living foreign languages for commercial purposes. The English, too, are beginning to understand its extreme commercial importance. Even the casual reader knows what alarm has been felt in England for a considerable number of years over the "German invasion." After commenting upon this fear, the report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1899-1900\* continues as follows: "A commission was, therefore, appointed in 1880 to examine into the condition of technical instruction and its influence upon the economic situation of the country. The report of this commission in 1884 did, in fact, show that England was behind the continental nations in technical matters, and that this was a consequence of less education in general, and of a want of acquaintance with modern languages, economic geography, and other branches in particular." Germany, France, England, and to a considerable extent the North—notably New York and New England—have seen the industrial and commercial value of modern language training. This is without question one of the great reasons why the City of New York

---

\*Vol. 1, p. 78.

provides five years of instruction in German in her public schools. The South has before her an era of great commercial prosperity, but she, too, must cultivate the modern languages much more than she has ever dreamed of doing—if she is really to enter into commerce upon the magnificent scale possible to her.

The importance of French and German to the diplomat is clear without discussion. French is even now in considerable measure the language of diplomacy. In chemistry, in engineering, indeed in all technical pursuits that require a knowledge of natural science, a familiarity with French and German is necessary if the best work is to be accomplished. In architecture French is especially necessary; for France is pre-eminently the land of architects, and art is the very life-breath of a Frenchman. The value of travel is doubled and trebled to him who knows German and French.

But to my mind the one who will find a knowledge of these languages most profitable is the boy who goes to college. The present period of classical study has been called the German Period, no other designation would be an accurate one. The student who cannot use Latin texts with German annotations and who cannot read the work of German commentators is frequently compelled to employ a poor rehash by a weaker scholar as a make-shift. Many a teacher of high purpose has been compelled to suffer bitter disappointment, and content himself with lamentably inferior results for this very reason. The same may be said of the study of Greek. Work in any sort of philology is exceedingly unsatisfactory without a knowledge of French and German. This is no less true of English than of Hebrew philology. In economics and history, much of the most valuable collateral reading is found in German and French. In mathematics, too, the material in these languages is superior to that in English. How can a young man pursue his philosophy satisfactorily without being able to read in the original the works of Descartes, Voltaire, Rousseau, Condillac, Condorcet, Comte, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Schopenhauer and Lotze? His ignorance must frequently deny him the power of going to the fountains of knowledge. But we must teach our boys to go, so far as possible, to the sources of things, and not to be content with what some one says that some one

has said to be some one's opinion of any given matter. I believe firmly that a young man coming to a college which has a first-class library, who enjoys intelligent direction, applies himself properly, and can freely and accurately read French and German will be able to double the value of his collegiate training. I take pleasure at this point in quoting a noteworthy passage from President Eliot's *Educational Reform*:\* "I cannot state too strongly the indispensableness of both French and German to the American or English student. Without these languages he will be much worse off in respect to communicating with his contemporaries than was the student of the seventeenth century who could read and speak Latin; for through Latin the student of the year 1684 could put himself into direct communication with all contemporary learning. So far as I know, there is no difference of opinion among American scholars as to the need of mastering these two languages in youth. The philologists, archæologists, metaphysicians, physicians, physicists, naturalists, chemists, economists, engineers, architects, artists and musicians, all agree that a knowledge of these languages is indispensable to the intelligent pursuit of any one of their respective subjects beyond its elements. Every college professor who gives a thorough course of instruction—no matter in what department—finds himself obliged to refer his pupils to French and German authorities. In the reference library of any modern laboratory, whether of chemistry, physics, physiology, pathology, botany, or zoölogy, a large proportion of the books will be found to be in French or German. The working library of the philologist, archaeologist, or historian teaches the same lesson. Without a knowledge of these two languages, it is impossible to get at the experience of the world upon any modern industrial, social, or financial question, or to master any profession which depends upon applications of modern science..... Boyhood is the best time to learn new languages; so that as many as possible of the four languages, French, German, Latin, and Greek, ought to be begun at school." President Eliot, after stating the advantages of learning the four languages in the secondary school, and explaining the difficulties in the way of this desirable arrangement, continues: "Therefore I believe that an option should be allowed

---

\**Educational Reform*, p. 103.

among these four languages at college admission examinations, any three being accepted, and the choice being determined in each case by the wishes of the parents, the advice of the teachers, the destination of the candidate, if settled, the better quality of accessible instruction in one language than in another, or the convenience of the school which the candidate attends." The reasons, then, why a boy going to college should have his modern languages in early youth are (1) because it is the only psychologically proper time (2) because it will greatly enhance the value of his college course if he is able freely and accurately to use them from the time of entrance. If the boy comes to college with two classical languages, he should come also with one modern language. If he enters with but one classical language, he should not enter with less than two modern languages.

Charles Francis Adams has stated the practical value of modern language study very forcibly in his address "A College Fetish." I quote one sentence in conclusion: "With the exception of the law, I think I may safely challenge any one of you to name a single modern calling, either learned or scientific, in which a worker who is unable to read and write and speak at least German and French does not stand at a great and always recurring disadvantage. He is without the essential tools of his trade."

## Our Duty to the Negro\*

By JOHN CARLISLE KILGO, D. D.,

President of Trinity College

Between a real problem and an imaginary problem there is essential difference. In every live and progressive nation there will never be any lack of real problems. But a people may develop an intellectual morbidness that magnifies the slightest friction into a perilous condition. Doubtless many of the so-called American problems are only creatures of a morbid sensitiveness of mind, into which many men have worked themselves. Just at this time the negro problem has been set forth as one of America's greatest issues, and, since the negro has his home in the South, it is regarded as the supreme problem of Southern civilization. How much of this problem is real and how much of it is fictitious need not be discussed. No doubt there is much of it that is real; but be that as it may, the fact should never be overlooked that no problem can be settled in the white heat of passion. Passion aggravates; it never settles an issue. So the white man who hates the negro and the negro who hates the white man will render no assistance in settling this race problem. Men trained to look at a question in the clear light of a sober judgment and to consider all the details of it are the men who settle the questions of a civilization.

There are four phases of the negro problem, as there are four points from which his life may be viewed. These are his religious, his industrial, his social, and his political duties and progress. The present agitation of the negro problem concerns itself almost entirely with his political relations and tasks. It is true that the question of his social relation is brought into the discussion. However, no one will deny that the present prominence given to the study of the negro came out of an intense political sensitiveness. The temporary reign of the combined constituencies of the republican and populist parties brought to the negro a political importance and power which did him hurt by creating a fear

---

\*An address delivered before the students of Trinity College and the citizens of Durham, N. C., September 21, 1903.

among the better class of the white race that the negro might return to power and the days of reconstruction be repeated in the South. To a very large extent this was an honest, as well as a natural, fear; but there was a class of politicians who, taking advantage of this fear, made the negro the chief issue of politics. As the chief issue of a political campaign, the worst sides of his character were portrayed in the strongest terms. For twenty years the South had been comparatively quiet on the race problem, but these new conditions set leaders of political parties to studying the arts of party protection. New election laws and amendments of constitutions were proposed, while methods employed in elections had more regard for party success than for civic morals. The fact that amendments of constitutions usually required educational qualifications for voters forced the question of education into political prominence; and, under the conditions, made the question of the negro's education a political issue. This is a mere outline of recent facts of history, but the outline is sufficient to show that the present discussion of the negro came out of politics and is a political discussion.

Political feelings are the most intense feelings. Especially is this true in the South. And when these feelings are greatly aroused it is not hard to magnify a mistake into a crime, a blunder into a disaster, and even a falsehood into a real peril. So the incident of Booker Washington in the White House, the presence of negroes at one of the regular social functions of the President, and similar incidents, were the occasions for wide discussions, which became the cause of intense racial feelings, and introduced into the discussion of the negro the old question of social equality. This new feature widened the discussion, and others besides politicians began to speak and write about the negro. Without his effort, even without his desire, the negro has been forced into prominence as a problem. However, the real problem seems to have shifted from the negro to the white man, and what began as a negro problem has developed into a problem for the white man to work out.

There are some historical facts concerning the negro which should not be forgotten. He did not come to America on his own motion. He came because he had to come. He was brought to America as a commodity of trade. It is no matter to him whether

Old England or New England, or both, captured his ancestors in Africa and brought them to America and sold them as slaves. The negro is not given to migration, and doubtless would have remained in Africa had he not been taken by force and brought to America.

He did not fix his social position. He was bought to serve, and the same power which brought him from Africa made of him a servant and decided the kind of service he should render. He seemed to fit into an aristocratic order of society and accepted his place as a servant without any great amount of discomfort.

He did not of his own motion make himself the issue of the civil war. Congressmen from the South and from New England discussed him, and worked themselves into a passion about him, which broke forth into a horrible contention of blood. In this contention he behaved himself with notable loyalty and service. He accepted the issues of the civil war as the settlement of a fearful contention between the North and his Southern owners.

He did not ask for the ballot. That was given to him by the white legislators of the nation. The use or misuse he may have made of the ballot was in obedience to the orders of those who passed the fifteenth amendment and made him a voter.

In some of the Southern States the ballot has been taken from many of them, or, to be more accurate, constitutions have been so changed that only a small number of negroes can vote. This was done without their request, and those who have watched most closely the negroes to whom the ballot has been denied, must admit that they seem about as well satisfied not to vote as they were to vote.

He had no choice in the matter of fixing his primary ideas of civilization. Beginning as a slave, he submitted to the ideas of his owner in those matters as well as in industrial matters. Under the laws of servitude which forced him to carry out the will of his owner, by a natural process he became an imitator of his master, and this easily became the method of his primary education in civilization.

There are natural qualities of character which are creditable to the negro. He is a lover of success. He has never showed any jealousy of the men who have attained prominence in society or in the world of commerce. On the contrary, the negro likes a

successful man and dislikes an unsuccessful man. It is this quality in his character which keeps him from becoming a socialist, a communist, a paternalist, or any other sort of social revolutionist. Left to himself he is essentially an aristocrat in his notions of government and society.

The negro is what you may call a jolly creature. It cannot be said that he has what is generally understood by the term wit and humor, especially the higher forms of them, but he is jolly. The Indian is a sullen man and does not know how to laugh; the negro scarcely knows how to be serious. He is the world's great laugher. It is this quality in his character that makes it hard for him to nurse spites and pessimism. Whistling, laughing, dancing and singing belong to his nature, and have served to break much that is dreary in his life.

It is easy for the negro to be religious. He has no tendency toward any of the forms of infidelity and scepticism. Much of what many negroes call religion has in it all the qualities of superstition, especially is this true of the extreme religionists among them; but it is to the credit of the negro that he becomes over-religious instead of becoming sceptical. Judging from the standpoint of psychology the negro is evidently in the emotional period of his evolution, and it is well that his chief emotions are the singing, whistling, dancing, and shouting emotions.

It is not worth while to enumerate the negro's weaknesses. They are now, and have been, duly, if not unduly, stressed. There has been no disposition to overlook the enormity of his shortcomings. However, there is nothing unusual in the character and nature of these weaknesses; they are the same weaknesses that belong to human nature regardless of racial distinctions, and in the negro only manifest themselves in those forms peculiar to a race at his stage of moral and intellectual development. The cynic has read a peculiar enormity and turpitude out of the weaknesses and crime of the negro, but the cynic can see nothing good in anything. Cynicism is a type of insanity that is blind to all that is good and far-sighted to all that is evil, but the standards of it are as unjust as its teachings are mean and false. It is not fair to measure anything at its lowest point or when it is at its greatest disadvantage. Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe showed slavery at its lowest point, and "Uncle Tom's Cabin" is a dreary



libel of thousands of slave owners who had in them a genuine regard for the welfare of their slaves. "The Leopard's Spots," following the same standards of judgment, seems to be an effort to even matters by showing the negro in his worst phase. Both books are narrow and pessimistic. Instead of judging things at their lowest points, they should be judged at their highest points. David, judged in the light of his horrible sin, is a criminal, but David, judged in the light of his penitential prayers, his heroic deeds, and his persistent efforts to upbuild his nation, is a character full of instruction and inspiration. When any man attains to a great height or does a noble deed, he sets a new standard for the ambitions of all men. It is the effort to reach these higher attainments, which at first seem extraordinary, that produces a race of strong men, to whom these things become the common level of life. By this process the human race has had its evolution, and for this reason each life should be taken at its highest point, thus furnishing increasing hopes to those who are striving for better things. The best negro is not in the penitentiary, nor should he be judged by the indolent, insolent, and worthless members of his race. If this standard of judgment is fair for the negro it is fair for the white man, but who would judge American patriotism by the treason of Benedict Arnold? Every race has a right to be duly credited with its heroes, and what the race may be should be decided by the best possibilities which have been revealed by its best members. There are bad negroes, there are bad men in every race, but there are good negroes. The old farm hand, patiently filling his place in the field, eating his simple meal in his hut, and going about to render such service as he may be able to render, is not a bad man and should not be hated because in his race is a class of degraded and debauched men and women.

What is the negro's problem? Has he a mission in the kingdom of human life? Is there a service which he may render and which he should render to the world? The negro problem is a simple problem, at least it is not hard to state. It is the problem of a man whose business it is to lift himself from a lower plane of life and character to a higher one, to fit himself to fill the mission of a negro man in the world's progress, to render the very best service which he, as a member of a distinct race, can render. There

is nothing peculiar in this problem. It is the problem at which all races of men have been working for thousands of years. The Anglo-Saxon has two thousand years the start of the negro. Unfortunately for the negro, he is behind all other races, for he started late; but his late start is reason for pity, instead of cause for contempt. It is a great thing to know that he has started. Even the smallest advance which he may have made along any line is evidence that he can advance, at least in some direction, and this gives the world some degree of hope for him. His advances show that his difficulties are not altogether incurable. The ancestors of the Southern negro were savages of the worst kind, but within two hundred years, under the training of Southern civilization, they have learned new lessons and show a capacity to acquire very much of a civilized life.

The negro is a negro. His color and his racial characteristics were ordained of God and cannot be changed. He cannot become a Jew and he cannot become an Anglo-Saxon and should not wish to become either. He can be a negro and it is his chief business to be a good negro. In the kingdom of human life virtue is not a matter of color, and the negro should learn to respect his color. The blacker he is the surer he may be of racial integrity, and of whatever he may come to be as a black man.

There is a class of men who assert that the negro is extremely limited in his capacities. Some of these are extreme enough to assert that it is a waste of means and effort to attempt the development of the negro. There is an extremer class who boldly assert that the negro was ordained to a life of ignorance and degradation. Such men do not represent the world's best faith: they do not represent that class of men who have advanced permanent good in the earth. It has been ordained that whatever may be made better should be made better. Under this law all forms of life assert their claims. A dog that may be made a better dog should be made a better one; a horse whose speed may be increased should have it increased; and, following this fundamental principle, men have worked through the centuries to improve the breed of all domestic animals, and for their efforts there has been a profitable return. By what law has the negro been left out of the right to be a better negro and to render a better service? The attempt to deny him this privilege is an attempt

to take from him that which men grant to dogs and horses and cows. He lifts his dusky face into the face of his superior and asks why he may not be given the right to grow as well as dogs and horses and cows. For a superior race to hold down an inferior one simply that the superior race may have the services of the inferior, was the social doctrine of mediævalism. Americans cannot explain why they shudder at the social horrors of the tenth and eleventh centuries and are themselves content to keep the weak in their weakness in order that the strong may rule better.

In the face of all doubts, honest and dishonest, concerning the negro's capacity for growth, it must be maintained that he can grow. It is not a question as to whether he can grow as rapidly and grow as much as another race; it is simply a question as to whether he can grow as a negro and fill the mission of his life. This question has been answered. He is capable of improvement; he has been improved. The negro in the South is not the same type of man originally sold in the South.

Very much will have been done to solve the negro problem when men come to speak of him more as a man and less as a problem. Discussed as a problem he is in danger of thinking himself something special, enigmatic, mysterious and confusing. In this state of mind he will not be disposed to take a sober view of himself, and instead of solving a problem, one of worse nature will be created. Instead of making him think of himself as a low and worthless sort of creature, make him terribly conscious of all the qualities of a personality.

If the negro cannot be made to fill the mission of a human life, if he cannot be made to fill a higher place in the kingdom of human life, then American civilization must acknowledge a defeat, it has found a race of people which it cannot benefit, the Christian religion has discovered a man that it cannot save. In such a defeat the negro can have no responsibility and no chagrin. It is not his, it is the defeat of the Christian religion and the American civilization.

In passing from a lower to a higher plane of life and manhood, the negro must travel the ordinary way of progress along which all other races have come. He must be given time to grow. The evolution of racial character is slow and tedious, and no improved formula has been found by which a race can rise in a

century to the highest duties and offices of an advanced civilization. The negro himself must learn this, and in learning it learn to be patient, and like Abraham, follow a promise which was fulfilled centuries after he had passed away. So the enthusiastic and over-zealous friend of the negro race must learn to be patient. An effort to override the laws of the evolution of life will bring sure destruction, and the negro will find his worst enemy in that man who wishes to rush his progress by some process of false growth.

The destiny of the human race is a moral destiny. All the laws of life and progress are in the interest of moral development. The history of every race makes clear the truth that men advance as they grow in virtue and truth and that they decay as they lose moral power. The negro is no exception to this ethnic law. His destiny is a moral destiny; his equipment for a serviceable mission in life must be a moral equipment. No amount of wealth, no amount of social law, no amount of political gifts, can substitute for the lack of moral power and growth. The place which a man may fill in the kingdom of human life depends upon his ideals, his faiths, his loves, his hopes, his motives, his sympathies, and his powers of self-restraint and self-direction. As the negro learns these things he will find himself better fitted to assume the responsibilities and work at the tasks of a growing man.

The development of the moral resources of the individual and of the race, is not a spontaneous development. On the contrary it is a very laborious and complicated task. Each century has added something to the machinery that is being worked for the moral progress of mankind, but the machinery will not be perfected until everything is organized to this end.

The moral growth of the negro like the moral growth of every race rests upon his intellectual growth. Ignorance is not the mother of virtue in any race of people. If it is a hurt to the negro there is no logic by which it may be proved to be a benefit to the Anglo-Saxon. God has never made any race of men who are better because they are ignorant and better in proportion to their ignorance. The assertion that education ruins the negro proves too much. It cannot be denied that the negro who goes from the plow to college does not return from the college to the plow, but this is no truer of the negro than it is of the young

white man. It cannot be denied that education creates discontent, for whatever changes a man's ideas changes his desires, and since education is a process of changing ideas and standards of thought, it necessarily produces discontent. But a well-ordered and well-controlled discontent lies back of all improvement. Whether education shall be helpful or whether it shall be hurtful depends, not upon the fact that it creates discontent, but upon the quality of the discontent and the power to govern it for worthy ends. It cannot be expected that colleges shall produce hod-carriers and plowmen. However, they should produce men who believe in work and who are both willing and able to do that class of work for which they are best fitted and which will render the largest service to mankind. The complaint, therefore, brought against colleges that they do not prepare men to fill the lower walks of life, is a truth which cannot be denied, but it is not to be expected that they should do so, for if higher education has any meaning, it means an effort to make a higher man for higher things.

It is admitted that education is not altogether an innocent thing. There is a hurtful education and there is a helpful education, but whether education benefits or hurts any one depends more on the teacher and the education given than it depends on the one who is educated. Certainly the results of it cannot depend upon the color of the person taught. If the ideals of education are low, if the motives of it are selfish, if the aims of it are material, if the sympathies of it are narrow and the methods are false, the education will be hurtful, not only to the educated man, but to society at large. If the ideals of education are high and true, if the motives of it are pure and noble, if the aim of it is to fit a man for better service, if its sympathies are broad and sincere, if the methods are sound and sober, and if it gives one a mastery over all his powers and makes him an unselfish member of society, it will prove a benefit to all races of men. It is not denied that some negroes have been hurt by education. It has created in them a conceit and pompous self-assertion, a social arrogance and wild and false ambitions, and unfitted them for any responsible place in a social organization. But these same unfortunate results may be found among educated men of all races and nations. Some Anglo-Saxons have been ruined by it.

Educators have not yet fully solved the problems of education, and it is a painful fact that there are too many of them who are indifferent to the proper solution of these problems, but be this as it may, the failure of education to do all that it may do, is not a racial question nor a racial issue.

Very much attention is being given to the kind of education most profitable for the negro race at its present stage of progress. In general terms the answer is easy. That education which is best adapted to advance the negro in moral truth and moral character is the education best adapted to his needs and the one that should be given him. Moral development begins at the point of common necessities. The first moral truths which the savage must learn are those truths which come to him in his efforts to provide for his temporal necessities. The first virtues which he must cultivate are those virtues which regard health and cleanliness and food and raiment and shelter. Until these have been learned higher moral lessons cannot be learned. In slavery the negro was taught the primary lessons of his material necessities. But higher lessons in industry must be learned, for out of them are developed the spirit of perseverance, of patience, of self-denial, and of self-direction. So the education given at Tuskegee and Hampton is founded in wisdom. However, industrial education does not and cannot develop the highest and broadest moral character. If the negro is only capable of learning the lesser morals and filling the lesser spheres of moral duty, then industrial education will prove sufficient for all his development. If this be a final estimate of him then he should not be held responsible to the higher ethics of society and civics. If he is to be judged by the standards of high moral life, then he must be given those things which will fit him to meet the duties and tasks of this higher moral life. To shut a race within narrow limits forces it to develop a contentment with a low order of things. The right of the negro to study literature and philosophy does not rest upon the possibility, or even the probability, of his producing a great poem, carving a great statue or painting a great picture. It rests upon the right of every man to look as far into the universe as he can, and gather to himself all the powers of thought and spirit that may lift him, though it may lift him by small degrees. The right to study Shakspeare, Angelo, and Raphaël

does not depend upon a man's ability to write Macbeth, to carve David, or to paint the Transfiguration. It rests upon the right of every hungry soul to be fed at the best tables; and to deny to the negro the strongest and the highest influences is to enslave him to a life of moral weakness and moral degradation. And the God who made him in the final settlement of human history will not likely overlook such unrighteous conduct.

In the moral development of the negro, which includes all of his development, the white man of America has a grave responsibility and a rich opportunity. It is not the responsibility of one section, it is the responsibility of the whole nation. We are one people, and this nation cannot be weak at one point without that weakness being felt at every point. A dangerous element in one section of the nation is a danger to every section of the nation, so the duty to the negro race is no more a duty of New Orleans, Atlanta, and Charleston than it is of Boston, New York and Chicago. The fact that the negro lives in the South does not relieve the North and the West from moral responsibility; for moral responsibilities are not matters of geographical location, they are questions of moral relations and moral opportunities. Those men, therefore, who assert that the North has nothing to do with the problem of improving this race and making them safe and serviceable citizens, not only speak hurriedly but speak blindly. This class, though, are not to be condemned any more than the class who ignore the feelings and sentiments of the South and would make of the negro a kind of citizen that would be neither servicable nor safe.

The South has not entirely disregarded its duties to this race. In the Southern home and on the Southern plantation the negro was taught his first lessons of civilization. The fact that he learned these lessons as a slave does not obviate the fact that he learned them in the South. Slavery has been one of the stages through which other peoples and nations have passed in their early development, and through it the negro received no small benefits. No one would be so foolish as to defend slavery as a permanent organization of society; yet as a temporary method of impressing the first lessons in civilization upon a race just emerging from savagery, it has had it notable benefits. Besides this source of help, there has been no lack of strong and true white men in

the South who have had a genuine interest in the negro's welfare. Bishop Atticus G. Haygood gave to their development the best energies of his matured strength, while Bishops W. W. Duncan and Warren A. Candler have always exerted themselves to advance the best interests of the negro race. The leading churches in the South have had some concern for the salvation of this people; but after all due credit has been given, it still remains true that the negro looks to the white man for help, and has a right to expect his help, and the white man can do much more than has been done to help the negro to a better life. This right is founded in the fact that the white man is a superior race, that the negro is a citizen of this country, that whatever makes him a weak citizen in this nation concerns the entire nation; and above all these, the negro's right to expect help from the white man rests upon the unchanging and unchangeable laws of righteousness, that bend all men, at all times and in all places, to do the right thing instead of doing that which seems most convenient and most pleasing.

In doing for this race what should be done for it the church is expected to have a leading, if not the leading, part. This expectation arises from the teachings of the Christian religion, which teachings are the foundation of the church's faith. Christianity does not exclude any race of people from hope and salvation, but on the contrary, it inspires in every people, of whatever race, a living hope for better things. "God is no respecter of persons" is a fundamental truth in Christian faith. Jews, Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Arabians, Parthians, Medes, Elamites, all heard the words of the gospel of Jesus Christ on the day the church was formally inaugurated for the world's redemption. At the present time the church in America is asserting catholicity of faith with marked energy, and sending its missionaries to all continents and islands, laboring among all races, classes and conditions, with the hope of bringing them into the kingdom of God, which is the kingdom of redemption. This zeal is one of the startling developments of the past half century. But wherein lies the consistency of a zeal for the salvation of the negro in Brazil, the denizen of the Fiji Islands, and the savage in the jungles of Africa, while the ten million negroes of this land go about largely excluded from the missionary efforts of the American church, whose walls



they dug out of the mud and formed into brick? By what process of reasoning can be reconciled a tremendous effort to raise the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands out of their degradation and yet give no place to a faith in the Southern negro's future?

What sort of argument makes it consistent for the Christian woman in America to give her time and efforts to the management of a missionary society for the salvation of the degraded ten thousand miles from her home, while she passes over a fine field for Christian work in her kitchen? Is it fully in keeping with the Christian religion to pay and pray for the salvation of India and do nothing for the one who nurses the babe of the worshipper? There may be a logic by which it can be proved that it is heroism in a white missionary to teach negroes in Brazil and spurn the idea in America, but there are not a few sincere men who are unable to discern it. For the American church there is today on the face of the whole globe no other missionary field more inviting and from which comes louder and more plaintive calls than the ten million negroes that live in the Southern States. To have an ear for the cries in all other places in the earth and no ear to hear the cries of these servants at our doors and about our streets, has something in it of the appearance of insincerity. It is, to say the least, rather queer doctrine, and the time has come for the church to give some consideration to the logical consistency of its creeds. If the negro has a wrong faith, and there are not a few who say he has, if he has incorrect ideas of social ethics and business obligations, in the name of God who is to teach him better ways? It is not enough to advertise the weakness of a race, something must be done to remedy it, and those who are quick to see the weak points are the ones upon whom rests the first duty to undertake the cure of them. It is cruel to mock the blind who is trying to lead the blind because there is no other who will lead.

However clear may be the mission of the church to this race, the state has also a clear duty. In these latter times the idea of the state's functions has been greatly widened, and without discussing the wisdom of some of the modern theories concerning the extent of these functions, it is very generally accepted that the state should not impede the righteous progress of any class of its citizens, and that its laws should be so administered that

each citizen may entertain all worthy ambitions of growth. Certainly no place is given in the modern state to the idea that the weak class should be kept weak because it is weak. Such a policy would not be defended by any sober minded man. This does not say that the weak class should be the ruling class. If anything is clear it is that the right to govern rests upon the capacity to govern, and those who are fittest to rule should rule. This is in the interest of the weak, and any method of selecting for rulers the unfittest man is a false method. The affairs of the government of a high civilization are too intricate to be committed to the direction untrained hands and minds. For such a task the negro is not prepared and of this no one is surer than the best representatives of the negro race. But the negro is a citizen of this nation and it is to the interest of the nation that he be made a good and serviceable citizen, and unto this end the government should be administered. Danton and Marat tried to build a republic on party tyranny and declared, "We must strike terror into the hearts of our foes. It is our only safety." Such a republic could not even come to birth. Hopefulness is the strength of citizenship and the state that crushes it out crushes out its own life.

In the performance of its duty to the negro the state must act with a sympathy becoming the negro's lack of equipment for discharging the highest tasks of a citizen and must show a concern for his preparation to perform them. A government does itself the greatest hurt when it makes any class of its citizens lose confidence in it, or makes them doubt whether their government is concerned for their protection. It has been the glory of America that it has held out a helping hand to all who needed help and this is still its noblest trait. The state, therefore, should not discriminate against any class of its citizens in the work of public education. It is to the credit of the Southern States that they have drawn no race lines in providing funds for the education of the children of these states, nor is there any likelihood that any such discrimination will be made.

The weaker classes in a state learn from the examples of the stronger classes and these examples should teach the soundest civic lessons. They should magnify the dignity of the state, they should give emphasis to the sanctity of law, and they ought to

inspire in all a love of truth and justice. For these reasons violations of the regular order of government produce the opposite effects intended by such extraordinary procedure. Mobs are poor teachers of civic righteousness; they do not create a public respect for the dignity and sanctity of the state. There are two victims of mob rule, the individual on whom the vengeance falls and the state.

All men, whatever may be their rank or their vocation, must come to take a sober view of the negro problem, if it must be called a problem. It must not be left to the demagogue, to the mob, to political intrigues, to the negro-hater among white men, or to the white-man-hater among the negroes. The issues are the issues of a human life and cannot be settled by passionate men of any race or section. The negro is here and though Thomas Jefferson declared that as a free man he could not live in the South with the white man, there are those who believe that something can be done in the Christian South that was not possible in pagan Rome or infidel France. The white man is not afraid of the negro and any intimation that he is in the least degree jealous of the negro is an imputation too feeble to be noticed. The Turk cannot live with the Jew, but in the South the negro has lived and learned and he can stay here and continue to learn. The man who has a knowledge of rural life in the South cannot fail to be impressed with the genuine confidence that exists between the white man and the country negro. It is an illustration that two races may be distinct in every sense and yet live in peace and common helpfulness. There are thousands of the best men in the South who are unwilling to espouse the Utopian dream of sending the negro to a region of his own, and there are thousands of the best negroes who are not going. Let those who have leisure write books about such a colony, but those who have fields to till, canals to dig, railroads to build, and other labor to do are not ready for such a migration. There are not a few who believe in their hearts that the negro can live his best life in the South, make his best friends in the South, render his best service in the South, come to his fullest growth in the South, and die in peace and full of hope in the South.

Nothing is more absurd than the cry of social equality between the races. It is a political hocus-pocus of the hugest sort. Social

equality is everywhere a matter of individual choice. It has been so always and always will be so. Each man chooses his own companions and chooses them on the grounds of personal congenialities. The negroes are not socially equal among themselves, neither are the white people, and the wild cry that the time will come when one man will be forced to associate with another contrary to his wishes is a night-mare. No law can force social equality; no local relations can force it; no sort of edict can force it; and social relations will never be established except by the choice of the parties forming the association; and the only way for the negro to become the associate of the white man is by the free consent of the white man. This social equality has been dragged into this question, but is no part of the negro problem, his problem is one of personal growth, not of social equality.

If the negro problem is not settled according to the eternal laws of righteousness, the negro will not be the only sufferer; he will not be the greatest sufferer; if it is settled in righteousness, he will not be the only one helped. Human life and human destiny are so marvelously interwoven in the principle of interdependency that the life which is spent in raising others is spent in raising itself, and so it is ordained that one finds his greatest growth in trying to make others grow. It is the unselfish, sacrificing soul that has a chance to rise to greatness in this world. God has so ordained it and none can reverse His laws. The contrary to this is true. The man, or the race of men who expend their energies in depressing the lowly go down with those they depress. If a lowly class becomes the occasion for the cultivation of spite, suspicions, tyranny in any form the worst victim will be the man in whom these things exist. What greater thing can be said to the credit of the South than that it took a race of people at a low point and nursed them into a character worthy of confidence and respect? What if other sections of this nation admit that they cannot raise the negro, what if other nations speak in terms of doubt about them, let the South show the world that the task which Providence has set for it shall be performed, and in the performance of it the South will find a grander Southerner with a deeper soul, richer heart, broader mind, and diviner record. In the efforts to exercise a deeper sympathy with the weak and lowly

any people will come to abide in a fuller confidence with themselves. But he who learns to hate an inferior class will eventually practice malice on all classes. One cannot hate a dog without eventually coming to hate men. The Girondists consented with the Jacobins to the death of Louis and Marie Antoinette, and shortly afterwards Danton and Robespierre contrived the execution of Madame Roland, and the day came when Robespierre consented to the death of Danton. Such is the history of social malice, having devoured its enemies it sets to work to devour itself.

To whom should this race look for better help and more sympathetic help than to the colleges of the South? It is not the business of the college to take up the excited feelings of the street and nurse them into stronger forms of passion. The college has a higher place in the life of the nation, it has a better service to render society. The college man should be able to see things in the light of the highest laws, to see them in all their bearings, to measure them in all their relations, to study them to the furthest conclusion, and speak of them with the calmness of one who regards the truth above all other considerations, who has an unshaken faith in the truth as the sure way to perfection, who holds a mastery over rabid passions and who knows how to work at hard things till they have been finished in the right way. If the college and the college men do not mean this to the nation, then they mean nothing that is worth while, they have no righteous claim to the confidence of the nation, they should be laughed out of business. For Trinity College no friend can covet a higher record than to send forth a body of strong men who will lay their hands cool and healing on the fevered brows of agitated men, who will speak a strong and faith-making word to doubting minds, and generously give out the resources of mind and heart to those who are most in need of them.

## BOOK REVIEWS

A HISTORY OF AMERICAN LITERATURE. By William P. Trent. Appleton & Co., New York, 1903, 608 pp.

The *Saturday Review* of September 12, 1891, says: "Americans deserve to have a literature, for, of all nations known to us, they are the most eager to do honor to the national prose and verse. There is something positively pathetic in the abundance of manuals, histories, and text-books of American literature. They follow one another with amazing rapidity, and to a superficial eastern eye they are almost minutely identical. They all exalt the same 'great' authors, they all express the same theory of the 'evolution' of American letters." Since the words were written at least ten histories of American literature have been written. A prominent man of letters started to write another last year, but after getting on his desk about twenty that had already been written, he gave up the project in despair.

The most recent of these—and I believe the best—is Professor Trent's volume in the "Literatures of the World" series. It is not marred by the defects complained of by the *Saturday Review*—it is original in plan and execution and there is not a note of provincialism in the book. The author is cautious in his judgments, weighing every American writer with due attention to the merits of the greater European authors. While he has written about many minor authors—minor even from an American standpoint—he considers them only as "fairly interesting" and "fairly important"—in the light of some tendency of American history and American life. One of the most valuable features of the book is Professor Trent's accurate and wide knowledge of all the tendencies of American life. His study of both history and literature has been of service to him in making something far better than a manual of literary history—it is a study in the intellectual growth of the American people as that growth has found expression—not in great literature—but in a body of more or less interesting and vital writing. As such it is interesting to the general public as well as to college classes.

There is scarcely a dull page in the book: even when dealing with the annalists of the seventeenth century, there is nothing of the Dry-as-dust. There is snap and vitality, due to a first-hand knowledge of the men he is writing about. Sometimes Professor Trent, perhaps, exerts himself too much to make the sequence of sentences and paragraphs easy—and to enliven facts. The sketches of the lives of the authors and of literary movements are concise, accurate and suggestive. The book will supplant other books on the same subject by reason of the fact that enough is given of even minor writers to give the student something to hang on to—a felicitous quotation, a brilliant characterization, or an illuminating interpretation. The estimates of the leading American authors represent the best academic opinion of the present time. To any but the most unreasonable New Englander or the most provincial Southerner they seem fair and balanced. One naturally turns to the estimates of Cooper, Poe, Emerson and Whitman, to test the author's critical point of view. In each case one is pleased with the "academic poise" of the writer—an admirable blending of penetration and sympathy. One now and then strikes a note of ultra cleverness and even smartness, but that is seldom. There is a body of criticism in this book that has not been excelled in recent American criticism.

The volume suggests so many lines of thought about American literature that it is impossible to compass them in a brief review. A more adequate treatment would be a long article on the study of American literature, based on Professor Trent's book and on other recent publications touching the same general subject.

EDWIN MIMS.

---

FINANCIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. By Davis Rich Dewey, Ph. D. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1903,—xxxv., 530 pp.

In this volume of the American Citizen Series, Professor Dewey has given an account of federal finance from the colonial period down to the present time. The text is supplemented by numerous charts and tables, and by full and discriminating bibliographical information. An admirable introductory chapter furnishes helpful suggestions for the guidance of students, teachers, and readers.

A single volume financial history of the United States has been long needed, and it is fortunate that the task of writing this book

has fallen into such competent hands. The result is a satisfactory text for use with college classes and a valuable reference work for the general reader. In the treatment of his subject the author gives a broad scope to the term "financial history," including a consideration of coinage and bank issues and other matters pertaining to the monetary system of the country. A sufficient reason for this method of dealing with the subject is found in the close interrelation of the subjects of money and finance in the narrow sense of the terms throughout the history of the United States. In the main, the amount of space assigned to the various periods and topics is well proportioned.

As is almost inevitable in a work of the kind, a few errors have crept into the text. Some of these are evidently typographical in nature and have escaped detection in the reading of the proof. For instance, Professor Bullock's monograph on the "Finances of the United States, 1775-1789," appears on page 12 as covering the period from 1775 to 1889. On page 20 John Benton Phillips should be John Burton Phillips. The pension act which is discussed on page 169 became law on March 18, 1818, and not on November 18 of that year. On page 149 we read that Calhoun gave his support to a bill introduced in 1816 for the establishment of a second United States bank. There is some difficulty in reconciling this with the statement a few lines below that "Smith of Maryland coincided with Calhoun that a bank was unnecessary." The compromise tariff of 1833 provided that between 1834 and 1842 duties should be reduced by a biennial excision of one-tenth of the excess percentage above twenty per cent, and not, as is stated on page 187, by a "biennial excision of one-tenth *per cent.* of the excess percentage above 20 per cent." On page 188 it is stated that the compromise tariff act of 1833 never went into complete effect. For the purpose of estimating the merits of the act as a revenue producer, this statement may be sufficiently accurate. But it is somewhat misleading in view of the fact that the reduction to a twenty per cent. rate of duty came into full effect on July 1, 1842, and remained in force until September 1 of that year. Possibly a closer examination of the work might disclose other doubtful or erroneous statements. However, such errors as have been noted are so comparatively unimportant that they detract little from the general excellence of the volume. In



plan, spirit, and execution it merits high commendation and will doubtless be widely used for purposes of college and university instruction.

WILLIAM H. GLASSON.

---

TEXAS, A CONTEST OF CIVILIZATIONS. By George P. Garrison. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1903,—vii, 320 pp.

This new volume in the American Commonwealths series is written by Professor Garrison, of the faculty of the University of Texas. The object, as the author explains in the preface, is not so much to write history as to make "a study based on history"—which is to say that he has attempted "to give a picture of what Texas is, and of the process by which it has become such." He has avoided foot notes almost steadily, and he has sought, but not with entire success, to rid the narrative of bare details. The author modestly protests that there are errors enough and he invites criticism. It is, perhaps, not a perfect book but a good one. It is a strong and clear story well told and direct. It holds its own with credit in the series in which it appears. If one were to seek for faults he might say that too much time is given to the early relations of Texas. Certainly one ought not to expect that a third of the book should be taken up with the early Spanish and French origins. One hundred and fifty additional pages are taken up with the struggle for autonomy and annexation. Only forty-four pages are left for the history of Texas while it is a commonwealth and of these forty-four fourteen are given to a statement of the State's resources. Yet it is intended to be a history of one of the American commonwealths. On the contrary, it must be remembered that this is a common fault with State histories. With them the interesting period is the period of separate existence. When they become members of the union their individuality seems to go from them, their politics seem to become divided, and one gallops over all kinds of internal and social movements without a pause.

A reader of Professor Garrison's book will carry with him a more favorable opinion of Texas and its people than he gets from the usual writers of American history, unless, indeed, he concludes that the picture is too lovingly painted. He will have sympathy for the Texan patriots. For the wise conservatism of

Stephen Austin and the men who sided with his faction he will have admiration. For the weak and foolish policy of the Mexicans he will have condemnation. With the author's views in these matters he will not be prepared to differ to any great extent. But he will be more surprised to read the opinion in regard to the part slavery in the United States played in the Texan situation. Says the author: "A still greater error has been committed by some in accepting the view that the colonization of Texas and the revolution was the work of the 'slavocracy.' Naturally enough, the movement resulted in a wide extension of the slaveholding area; but the idea that it was consciously inaugurated and carried out with that object in view is too palpably mistaken to be worth discussing." The reviewer has some misgivings about this opinion. Very likely the Texas immigrants went there from economic motives; but behind the movement as a whole was a conscious notion that it was aiding slavery extension. How else can we explain the feverish anxiety of the South to get the province by purchase? How else can we explain the aid which the revolutionists got so steadily in the South? Stephen Austin in January, 1835, found that he could get no aid in New Orleans unless Texas would declare for independence, which seems to have meant that the Southerners took no interest in building up a province which seemed to them to have no prospect of serving their purposes. The law of slavery which was incorporated in the Texas constitution was like the laws in the Gulf States of the union. It excluded free negroes, restrained emancipation, and though it forbade the African slave trade the committee to whom the matter fell declared that this was done out of regard to the opinions of European nations. Thus the Texans held the normal Southern position in regard to slaves. It would, therefore, be strange if they did not also desire its extension and perpetuation in the normal Southern way. They must have known that with Texas independent slavery must some day be abolished in the United States, and if abolished there, it was a matter of a short time before it would also be abolished in Texas.

## LITERARY NOTES

Miss Willa Sibert Cather, who makes her bow to the public as an aspiring poet, is a western woman, who lately has done dramatic and literary criticism for the *Pittsburg Leader*. Her volume, "April Twilights," (Boston: Richard Badger) belongs to the lighter poetry of the day, not without music, but lacking in depth of feeling or breadth of thought. Three other volumes from the same press are; "A Field of Folk," by Isabella Howe Fiske, "Young Ivy on Old Walls," by H. Arthur Powell, and "The Mothers," by Edward F. Hayward. Of all these the verse is lame and the sentiment rarely rises out of the commonplace.

The Library of Congress during the past summer has published "A Calendar of John Paul Jones Manuscripts in the Library of Congress," under the supervision of Charles H. Lincoln, Ph. D., of the Manuscripts Division. These documents came into the possession of the government in 1867 with the Peter Force Collection, which was purchased in that year. The calendar contains 883 entries arranged chronologically, and includes both letters to and letters from John Paul Jones. The work is done with commendable care and fulness. The volume in form and purpose is like the calendar of Washington Manuscripts which was published in 1901 by the same library and under the same supervision. The wisdom of Mr. Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, in publishing these calendars cannot be too highly commended.

Another publication of the Library of Congress which deserves commendations is a "List of Lincolniana in the Library of Congress," prepared by George Thomas Ritchie. It is not a complete bibliography; but only a check list of the books and pamphlets in the library either about Lincoln or containing writings by him. As one glances through it he is apt to fancy that its most valuable feature to the student is the large number of published addresses, sermons, and pamphlets on the great war Pres-

ident to which it refers. There may be larger collections of these in existence; but it is safe to say that no other collection is so well catalogued for the accommodation of the whole public.

On June 20, 1903, delegates met in Atlanta to form a conference of Confederate Roster Commissioners. They petitioned the Secretary of War for a relaxation of the severity of the instructions under which they had been directed to proceed to make out complete confederate rosters. These instructions confined them to actual rosters. As such rosters have frequently been lost or mutilated the commissioners desire to have the privilege of repairing the losses by using other reliable lists, as for instance the State pension lists. The Conference was largely the result of the efforts of Mr. Thomas M. Owen, State archivist of Alabama, who was elected its secretary.

## Index of Volume II.

- Adams, Charles Francis, 368.  
 Agriculture in the South, 107, 195.  
 Alabama, Peace Society in, 246.  
*Alabama, The Peace Movement in, Since the War*, by WALTER L. FLEMING, 114, 246.  
 "American at Oxford, An," by John Corbin, Review of, 191.  
 "American Cotton Industry, The," by T. M. Young, Review of, 187.  
*American Historical Review, The*, 104, 197.  
 "American Traits from the Point of View of a German," by Hugo Muensterberg, Review of, 188.  
*An Ancestral Pilgrimage*, by BERNARD C. STEINER, 178.  
*Another View of Our Educational Progress*, by WILLIAM E. DODD, 325.  
 "April Twilights," by W. S. Cather, 391.  
 Ashe, John, 322, 324.  
*Atlanta University Publications*, 137.  
*Atlantic Monthly. The*, 21.  
 Ballagh, James Curtis, "The History of Slavery in Virginia," Review of, 83.  
 "Bank of the United States, the Second," by R. C. H. Catterall, Review of, 193.  
 BASSETT, JOHN SPENCER, and GLASSON, WILLIAM H., *Two Recent Southern Books on the Negro*, 78.  
 BASSETT, JOHN SPENCER, *Industrial Decay of the Southern Planter*, 107.  
 ———, *Two Negro Leaders*, 267.  
 ———, *Stirring Up the Fires of Race Antipathy*, 297.  
 ———, Reviews—Thomas's, "The Dancers," 95; Cloud, "A Reed by the River," 95; Douglas, "Days We Remember," 95; Louthan, "Thoughts Adrift," 95; Payne, "Various Views," 96; McMaster, "Daniel Webster," 99; Catterall, "The Second Bank of the United States," 193; Phillips, "Georgia and State Rights," 195; Hunt, "Life of James Madison," 285; Hunter, "Memoirs of R. M. T. Hunter," 287; "Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society, Vol. VI.," 288; Garrison, "Texas," 389.  
 Benjamin, Judah P., 1, 7, 297.  
 Benton, E. J., 198.  
 Blue, F., 197.  
 Bogart, Ernest L., 103.  
 "Bombproofs," 116.  
*Book Reviews*, 88, 187, 285, 386.  
 BOWEN, EDWIN W., *An Ancient Roman Novel*, 125.  
 ———, *Is the Novel Decadent?*, 261.  
 Boyd, W. K., Reviews—Bryce, "Studies in History and Jurisprudence," 88; Robinson, "Introduction to the History of Western Europe," 93; Creighton, "The Church and the Nation," 91.  
 Brooks, John G., "The Social Unrest," Review of, 173.  
 Brooks, Phillips, on Education, 215.  
 Bryan, Needham, 323.  
 Bryan, William, 322, 323.  
 Bryce, James, "Studies in History and Jurisprudence," Review of, 88.  
 Buncombe, Edward, 314, 321.  
 Burroughs, John, "Literary Values and Other Papers," Review of, 96.  
 "Calendar of John Paul Jones' Manuscripts," 391.  
 "Calhoun as Seen by His Friends," 296.  
 CALLAHAN, J. MORTON, *The Confederate Diplomatic Archives—The "Pickett Papers,"* 1.  
 Candler, Bishop W. A., 380.  
 Carlyle, Thomas, *His Life of Cromwell*, 28.  
 Carter, Eva M., 198.  
 Caswell, Richard, 320.  
 Cather, W. S., 391.  
 Catterall, R. H. C., "The Second

- Bank of the United States," Review of, 193.
- Census Office Cotton Report and the Significant Development of the Cottonseed-Oil Industry*, by DANIEL CLIFFORD ROPER, 237.
- Chicago, University of, 103.
- "Church and the Nation, The," by M. Creighton, Review of, 91.
- Civil War, the Attempt to Avert, 273.
- Clanton, General, 248, 249, 250, 251.
- Clark, Prof. J. B., 105.
- Clemens, Jeremiah, 114, 120, 123.
- Cloud, Virginia Woodward, "Reed by the River, A," Review of, 95.
- "Commerce, General History of," by Wm. C. Webster, Review of, 286.
- Confederate Diplomatic Archives—The Pickett Papers*, by J. MORTON CALLAHAN, 1.
- Confederate Rosters, 392.
- Constitution of the United States Compared with the French Constitution of 1791, 56.
- Corbin, John, "An American at Oxford," Review of, 191.
- Cotton, Manufacture of, 187; Report of the Crop, 237.
- Cottonseed-Oil Industry, 237.
- Creighton, M., "The Church and the Nation," Review of, 91.
- Criticism, The Function of, in the South*, by EDWIN MIMS, 334.
- Cromwell, Oliver, Recent Lives of, 28.
- Cropping System, 111.
- Curry, J. L. M., 119; His Work for Education in Virginia, 201, 202, 203.
- DAVIS, SALLIE JOYNER, *North Carolina's Part in the Revolution*, 314.
- Dana, Charles A., 224.
- "Dancers, The, and Other Legends," by Edith M. Thomas, Review of, 95.
- "Days We Remember," by Marian Douglas, Review of, 95.
- Dewey, Davis R., "Financial History of the United States," Review of, 387.
- Disabilities, Legal and Political, Removed, 346.
- DODD, WILLIAM E., *Another View of Our Educational Progress*, 325.
- Douglas, Marian, "Days We Remember," Review of, 95.
- Dowd, W. C., 251.
- Du Bois, W. E., Burghart, 198, 267.
- DuBose, J. W., 198.
- DWIRE, HENRY RUDOLPH, *The New York Times and the Attempt to Avert the Civil War*, 273.
- Economics of the Plantation, The*, by Ulrich B. Phillips, 231.
- Editor, The, see Bassett, John Spencer.
- Education, Some Phases of Southern*, by JOHN CARLISLE KILGO, 137.
- Education: Industrial, 197; in Virginia, 199; and Religion, 209; Secularization of, 214; Reform of, 325.
- Eliot, President, 176, 214, 367.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, His Phi Beta Kappa Address, 11.
- Falkner, Jefferson, 252, 253, 254.
- FEW, WILLIAM PRESTON *Sidney Lanier as a Student of English Literature*, 157.
- "Field of Folk, A," by Isabella Howe Fiske, 391.
- "Financial History of the United States," by Davis R. Dewey, Review of, 387.
- Firth, Charles, *Life of Cromwell*, 32.
- Fisk, George M., 104.
- Fiske, Isabella Howe, 391.
- FLEMING, WALTER L., *The Peace Movement in Alabama During the Civil War*, 114, 246.
- Frazer, Robert, 203, 204, 206.
- French Constitution of 1791, The, and the United States Constitution; a Comparison*, by C. H. RAMMELKAMP, 56.
- French, the Study of, in Secondary Schools, 359.
- FRIZZELL, H. B., *Educational Progress in Virginia*, 199.
- Function of Criticism in the South*, by EDWIN MIMS, 334.
- Gardiner, S. R., on Cromwell, 31.
- Garrison, George P., "Texas, a Contest of Civilizations," Review of, 389.
- Georgetown, S. C., A Visit to, 178.
- "Georgia and State Rights," by U. B. Phillips, Review of, 195.

- German, the Study of in Secondary Schools, 359.
- Getting Together on the Negro Question*, by F. C. WOODWARD, 306.
- GLASSON, WILLIAM H., *Moses Coit Tyler and Charles Sumner*, 51.
- and the Editor, *Two Recent Southern Books on the Negro*, 78.
- , *Recent Books on Social and Industrial Questions*, 172.
- , *Reciprocity*, 281.
- , Reviews—White, "Money and Banking," 90; Young, "The American Cotton Industry," 187; Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*, 387.
- Governors, Southern, Conference of, 120.
- Green, Duff, the Papers of, 296.
- Gulf States Historical Magazine*, 198.
- HAMILTON, J. G. DER., *The Removal of Legal and Political Disabilities, 1868-1898*, 346.
- Hardy, Thomas, Criticism of, 27.
- Harvey, Col. John, 314, 315, 316.
- "Hawthorne, Nathaniel," by G. E. Woodberry, Review of, 101.
- Hawthorne, Influence on New England, 14.
- Haygood, Bishop Atticus G., 380.
- Hayne, Paul H., Poetry of, 36.
- Hayward, Edward F., 391.
- Hewes, Joseph, 323.
- Hillsboro, N. C., 296.
- History, The Status of in Southern Colleges*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE, 169.
- "History of Taxation in New Hampshire," 197.
- "History of American Literature," by W. P. Trent, Review of, 386.
- Hollander, J. H., 197.
- Hollis, E., 251.
- Hooper, William, 315, 323.
- How Does Religion Concern Education?*, by JOHN CARLISLE KILGO, 209.
- Howe, Robert, 319, 321.
- Humphreys, D. C., 122, 123.
- Hunt, Gailiard, "Life of James Madison," Review of, 285.
- Hunter, Martha T., "Memoir of R. M. T. Hunter," Review of, 287.
- "Hunter, R. M. T., Memoir of," by Martha T. Hunter, Review of, 287.
- Industrial Decay of the Southern Planter*, by THE EDITOR, 107.
- "Introduction to the History of Western Europe," by J. H. Robinson, Review of, 93.
- Iredell, James, 314.
- "Iron Clad Oath, The," 346.
- Is the Novel Decadent?*, by Edwin W. Bowen, 261.
- Jenks, Professor, "The Trust Problem," 103.
- Johns Hopkins Studies in History and Political Science*, 104, 198, 295.
- Johnson, Alvin S., 197.
- Johnston, Samuel, 314, 316.
- Jones, Allen, 322.
- Jones, D. W., 251.
- Jones, John Paul, 391.
- Jones, Willie, 314.
- KILGO, JOHN CARLISLE, *Some Phases of Southern Education*, 137.
- , *How Does Religion Concern Education?*, 209.
- , *Our Duty to the Negro*, 369.
- Kirkland, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, 151.
- Koch, Dr. Robert, 362.
- Lanier, Sidney, as a Student of English Literature*, by WILLIAM PRESTON FEW, 157.
- Lanier, Sidney, Career and Poetry of, 40.
- Laughlin, J. L., and H. P. Willis, "Reciprocity," Review of, 281.
- "Leopard's Spots, The," 373.
- Lewis, David P., 114.
- Library of Congress, 391.
- Lillington, Alexander, 321.
- Lincoln, C. H., 391.
- Lincolnia, 391.
- Literary Notes*, 103, 197, 290, 391.
- "Literary Values and Other Papers," by John Burroughs, Review of, 96.
- Longfellow, H. W., Journal of, 18.
- Lorenz, Dr., 363.
- Louthan, Hattie H., "Thoughts Adrift," Review of, 95.
- Lowell, J. R., 223, 224, 225, 226.
- McMaster, J. B., "Daniel Webster," Review of, 99.

- "Madison, James, Life of," by Gailiard Hunt, Review of, 285.  
 Mann, Ambrose Dudley, 9.  
 Mason, J. M., Correspondence of, 8.  
 Mason and Slidell, 7.  
 Martin, Alexander, 321.  
 Martin, Gov. Josiah, 314, 315, 317, 318, 320.  
 "Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, The," 316.  
 Milesians Tales, 126.  
 MIMS, EDWIN, *The Renaissance in New England*, 10.  
 ———, *The Reform Movement in New England*, 221.  
 ———, *The Function of Criticism in the South*, 334.  
 ———, Reviews—Burroughs, "Literary Values," 96; Woodberry, "Nathaniel Hawthorne," 101; Muensterberg, "American Traits" 188; Corbin, "An American at Oxford," 191; Trent, "History of American Literature," 386.  
 ———, Note on the Tenth Anniversary of *The Sewanee Review*, 290.  
 Mississippi Historical Society, Publications of, Vol. VI., Review of, 288.  
 Modern Language, Study of in Secondary Schools, 359.  
 "Money and Banking," by Horace White, Review of, 90.  
 Moore, Andrew B., 114.  
 MOORE, F. W., *Status of History in Southern Colleges*, 169.  
 ———, Edits Calhoun Extracts, 296.  
 Moore, James, 319, 321, 322, 324.  
 Morley, John, His Life of Cromwell, 33.  
 "Mothers, The," Edward F. Hayward, 391.  
 Muensterberg, Hugo, "American Traits," Review of, 188.  
 Nash, Francis, 296.  
 Nash, Col. Francis, 321.  
 "Negro in Africa and America, The," by Joseph Alexander Tillinghast, Review of, 78.  
*Negro, Two Recent Southern Books on, The*, by WILLIAM H. GLASSON and THE EDITOR, 78.  
*Negro Leaders, Two*, by THE EDITOR, 267.  
*Negro, Our Duty to, The*, by JOHN CARLISLE KILGO, 369.  
 Negro, as an Agricultural Laborer, 111; Race Conditions of in America, 152; Industrial Education of, 197; the Training of, 296, 297, 306, 369.  
 Negro, St. George Tucker's Plan of Emancipation, 200.  
 "Negro a Beast, The," 272.  
*New England, Renaissance of*, by EDWIN MIMS, 10.  
*New England, Reform Movement in*, by EDWIN MIMS, 221.  
 New Hampshire, Taxation in, 197.  
 North Carolina, Internal Improvements in, 295.  
*North Carolina's Part in the Revolution*, by SALLIE JOYNER DAVIS, 314.  
 Novel, *An Ancient Roman*, by EDWIN W. BOWEN, 125.  
 Novel, Its Position in Contemporary Literature, 261.  
*Our Duty to the Negro*, by JOHN CARLISLE KILGO, 369.  
 Owen, Thomas M., 392.  
 Oxford University, 191.  
 Page, Thomas Nelson, 300.  
 Parsons, L. E., 255, 259.  
*Passing of a Great Literary Force*, by HENRY N. SNYDER, 23.  
 Payne, William Morton, "Various Views," Review of, 96.  
*Peace Movement in Alabama, The*, by WALTER L. FLEMING, 114, 246.  
 Peace Society in Alabama, 246.  
 Person, Thomas, 322.  
 Petronius, Gaius, 126, 127.  
 PHILLIPS, ULRICH BONNELL, *The Economics of the Plantation*, 231.  
 ———, "Georgia and State Rights," Review of, 195.  
 Pickett, John T., 2, 3, 4, 5.  
 "Pickett Papers," 1.  
*Plantation, The Economics of*, by ULRICH BONNELL PHILLIPS, 231.  
*Planter, The Industrial Decay of the Southern*, by THE EDITOR, 107.  
 Poe, E. A., Criticism of, 35.  
*Political Science Quarterly*, 105.  
 POTEAT, W. L., *Science and Culture*, 68.  
 Powell, H. Arthur, 391.  
*Practical Value of Modern Language Study in the Secondary Schools*, by JOHN C. RANSMEIER, 359.



- Putnam, Herbert, 391.
- Quarterly Journal of Economics, 104, 197.
- Quarterly of, *The Texas State Historical Association*, 297.
- Race Heterogeneity in a Democratic Society*, by JOSEPH ALEXANDER TILLINGHAST, 152.
- RAMMELKAMP, C. H., *The French Constitution of 1791 and the United States Constitution; A Comparison*, 56.
- Rawles, Wm. A., 103.
- Raymond, Henry J., 273, 274.
- Recent Books on Social and Industrial Questions*, by WILLIAM H. GLASSON, 172.
- Reciprocity*, by WILLIAM H. GLASSON, 281.
- "Reed by the River, A," by Virginia W. Cloud, Review of, 95.
- Reform Movement in New England*, by EDWIN MIMS, 221.
- Removal of Legal and Political Disabilities, 1868-1898*, by J. G. DER. HAMILTON, 346.
- Renaissance of New England, The*, by EDWIN MIMS, 10.
- Reviews, Book, 103, 187, 285, 391.
- Revolution in North Carolina, *The*, 314.
- Riley, F. L., 294.
- Ritchie, G. T., 391.
- Robinson, James H., "An Introduction to the History of Western Europe," Review of, 93.
- Robinson, Maurice H., 197.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, *His Life of Cromwell*, 34.
- ROPER, DANIEL C., *Census Office Report and the Significant Development of the Cottonseed-Oil Industry*, 237.
- ROUTH, JAMES E., JR., *Some Fugitive Poems of Timrod*, 74.
- Ruffner, W. H., and Education in Virginia, 200, 201.
- Rutherford, Griffith, 322, 324.
- Ryan, Father, 40.
- Science and Culture*, by W. L. POTEAT, 68.
- Seibels, J. J., 251, 252, 254, 259.
- Sevier, John, *Diary of*, 294.
- Sewanee Review*, 290.
- Seward, W. H., 273, 275, 276, 277, 279, 280.
- "Shakspeare and His Forerunners," 157.
- Sheets, Christopher Columbus, 114.
- Shorter, John Gill, 115, 118, 119.
- Simms, W. G., *The Poetry of*, 35.
- Slavery, American, 228, 229.
- Slidell, John, Correspondence of, 8.
- SMITH, W. ROY, *Some Recent Cromwellian Literature*, 28.
- SNYDER, HENRY N., *The Passing of a Great Literary Force*, 23.
- "Social Unrest," by John Graham Brooks, Review of, 173.
- Socialism, Labor, and Other Arguments," by Bishop Spalding, Review of, 172.
- Some Recent Cromwellian Literature*, by W. ROY SMITH, 28.
- South, the Decay of the Planter Class, 107.
- South, Education in, see Education; Criticism in, 334.
- Southall, J. W., 207.
- Southern Educational Conference, 199, 311.
- Southern Poetry, 1849-1881*, by WILLIAM A. WEBB, 35.
- Southern Planter, The Industrial Decay of*, by THE EDITOR, 107.
- Spalding, Bishop, "Socialism and Labor and Other Arguments," Review of, 172.
- Sprague, O. M. W., 197.
- STEINER, BERNARD C., *An Ancestral Pilgrimage*, 178.
- Stirring Up the Fires of Race Antipathy*, by THE EDITOR, 297.
- "Studies in History and Jurisprudence," by James Bryce, Review of, 88.
- Sumner, Charles, Moses Coit Tyler and*, by WILLIAM H. GLASSON, 51.
- Swanson, Col., 249.
- Tariff and Reciprocity, 281.
- Tariff-Union, European, 104.
- "Texas, A Contest of Civilizations," by G. P. Garrison, Review of, 389.
- Thomas, Edith M., "The Dancers," Review of, 95.
- Thompson, Jacob, 3, 4, 5.
- "Thoughts Adrift," by Hattie H. Louthan, 95.
- Ticknor, Frank O., 40.
- TILLINGHAST, JOSEPH ALEXANDER, *Race Heterogeneity in a Democratic Society*, 152.
- , "The Negro in Africa and America," Review of, 78.

- Times, The New York, and the Attempt to Avert the Civil War*, by HENRY R. DWIRE, 273.
- Timrod, Some Fugitive Poems of*, by JAMES E. ROUTH, JR., 74.
- Timrod, Henry, Poetry of, 37, 74.
- Trent, W. P., Editor of *Sewanee Review*, 291, 292; "History of American Literature," Review of, 386.
- Trinity College, 385.
- "Trust Problem, The," by Professor Jenks, 103.
- Tucker, H. St. George, and Virginia Education, 203, 204.
- Tucker, St. George, and Virginia Education, 200.
- Tyler, Moses Coit, and Charles Sumner*, by WILLIAM H. GLASSON, 51.
- "Uncle Tom's Cabin," 372.
- United States Commissioner of Labor, 17th Annual Report of, 197.
- Vail, Edward, 342.
- Van Vorst, Mrs. John and Marie, "The Woman Who Toils," Review of, 175.
- Vance, John, 322.
- "Various Views," by William Morton Payne, Review of, 96.
- "Virginia, The History of Slavery in," by J. C. Ballagh, Review of, 83.
- Virginia, Educational Progress in*, by H. B. FRIZZELL, 199.
- Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 104.
- Wabash Trade Route, The, 198.
- Washington, Booker T., 267, 303, 370.
- , Littleton Quinter, 1.
- Watts, Thomas Hill, 115, 119, 121.
- Weaver, Charles C., "Internal Improvements in North Carolina," 295.
- WEBB, WILLIAM A., *Southern Poetry, 1849-1881*, 35.
- "Webster, Daniel," by John B. McMaster, Review of, 99.
- , Wm. C., "General History of Commerce," 286.
- Wendell, Professor Barrett, 10.
- White, Horace, "Money and Banking," Review of, 90.
- Wiggins, Chancellor of the University of the South, 151.
- Willis, H. P., and J. L. Laughlin, "Reciprocity," Review of, 281.
- Wise, Henry A., on Education, 200.
- "Woman Who Toils, The," by Mrs. John Van Vorst and Marie Van Vorst, Review of, 175.
- Woodberry, G. E., "Nathaniel Hawthorne," Review of, 101.
- WOODWARD, F. C., *Getting Together on the Negro Question*, 306.
- Yancey, Wm. L., 198.
- Young, T. M., "The American Cotton Industry," Review of, 187.
- "Young Ivy on Old Walls," by H. Arthur Powell, 391.
- Zola, Emile, Criticism of, 23.





